HISTORIA

Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata;

OR

ANIMADVERSIONS ON Dr. Heylin's QUINQUARTICULAR HISTORY.

IN WHICH,

1. The Aspersions cast on Foreign Reformers, are wiped off.
2. The Doctors manifold Contradictions, are manifested.
3. The Doctrine of the *Arminians*, in the five points, is proved, to be contrary to the Doctrine of the Reformed Church of *England*.

By *HENRY HICKMAN*, B. D.

Si moriens mordeat, mordeatur mortuus.

Ἄριστος ὁ πρὸς σέ μοι μάχη ἔστιν· καὶ γὰρ ἀκούεις τὰ κακὰ ἑκόντως, καὶ λέγεις εὐχερῶς. ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ λέγειν ἀνάγκη, καὶ ἀκούειν ἄκων. Euripid. Cenfor.

Printed in the year 1673.

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

READER,

I Am told the following Papers are mine: And really for substance I think they be: for I well remember, that sundry years ago, I did hastily, either write, or dictate to others to be written, a confutation of Dr. Heylins Historia Quinquarticularis, *that so I might remove a stone of offence, which some told me, I principally had occasioned to be laid in the way of young Students. Had I thought, so unstudied a scribble, meet to be exposed to publick view, I could then have sent it abroad, when either I could have procured a Licence to imprint it, or should not have been esteemed an offender, though I had imprinted it without a Licence. Some Friends have now*

adventured to put it forth without my privity, I doubt a little unseasonable, but I am confident with a good intention, therefore I must not be angry with them. As for the Printer and Corrector, I must needs say, they have been very careless; scarce any one page being free from faults, so gross, as any eye might have seen, any hand amended. Yea, I observe, that some body hath been so officious, as to entitle the Book all along, The History of *Arminians*, *which Tittle I must protest against as none of mine, nor any way proper. This unsuitable title, and the unhandsome distinguishing of the Book but into two parts, which I had distinguished into four, and the multitude of Errata's disturbing and perverting the sense, at first made such an impression on me, that I resolved to disclaim this Copy and to set out another more correct. But this purpose I soon laid aside, contenting my self, to make a Catalogue of such Errata's as might make my sense mistaken, and those I must desire thee, good Reader, before thou settest thy self to read, with thy pen to amend, litteral mistakes, &c. are easily rectified. For my self, I must desire thee once for all to take notice.*

1. *That I only relate some mens opinions Historically, and defend them from unjust aggravations, but am not concerned to maintain them to be true, or accurately expressed.*

2. *That I acknowledge there be some depths in the Controversie, relating to Predestination and Grace, which I am not able to fathom: Nor are these, the only points in Divinity, in which I believe some things, against which I have objections, that I cannot answer, any otherwise, than by saying, that every Divine Revelation must needs be true, though seemingly contrary to some*

thing

thing which my imperfect and corrupt reason apprehends to be true. It is commonly laid to the charge of the Socinians, *that they make reason the judge in Controversies of Faith, and so I verily think it is in some sense, but that it should be* Judex normalis, *the* norma *or* Rule *according to which we are to judge, so as we are to believe nothing, but what we could have demonstrated to be true, or possible by mere reason, is an opinion so wicked, that I hope it is but falsly fathered on the* Socinians. *I believe the Hypostatical Union, a Trinity of persons in the Unity of Essence, if a reason of this my Faith be asked, I will quote the Scriptures, which clearly assert those two Articles; having so done, I have resolved Faith into its first Principle, and I will continue stedfast and immoveable in my Faith though I cannot comprehend either how three Persons subsist in one numerical nature, or how two natures can be united so as to make but one person. In like manner I will believe the Doctrine of Original Sin as it is explained in our Articles of Religion, because I find that explication of it, agreeable to Scripture, though I cannot so clearly make it out to my own or another mans reason, how Original sin is propagated. I will also believe,* that God hath mercy on whom he will, and hardneth whom he will, *bestoweth his determining Grace on whom he will, and denieth it to whom he will, because this is a Scripture Doctrine, though the reconciling of Gods eternal Decrees, and the efficacy of Grace, with the liberty of mans will surpass my knowledge. And I am the more confident that I am not mistaken in thinking this to be a Scripture Doctrine, because, as I have shewen in the following Papers, it hath been so adjudged by the Antient Fathers of the Church. Nor is it a small confirma-*

tion to me, that the greatest opposers of Calvinism *(as they are resolved to call it) have, after the highest straining of their wits and diligence, been able to say nothing against it, but what the* Pelagians, *and* Semipelagians *had before objected against St.* Austine, *and his Disciples. I know there be many who think quite otherwise; these will say,* quid tandem *Arminio* cum *Pelagio,* aut quid *Calvino* cum *Augustino.* Arminius *learned not his opinions from Pelagius, nor did* Calvin *owe his notions to S.* Austin. *Such men I earnestly desire impartially to consider what I have hereafter produced and if they can answer my allegations I will thank them for undeceiving me. But this I will tell them, that he who hopes to make me his proselite, must be*

1. *No Railer, nor Reviler. I have read that some in olden times, through I know not what foolish and wicked superstition thought* Garden Basill *(that I suppose answers to* Plinies Ocimum*) would grow the sooner and better, if it were sown* cum convitiis & maledictis, *with reproaches and evil speaking: So, many of late seem to have been of opinion, that the Doctrine which they plant, will prosper the better, if they water it with torrents of contumely against those that differ from them. Perhaps the more rank their stile is, the more it may please some Readers; But he was wise who said;* As dead flies cause the Oyntment of the Apothecary to send forth a stinking savour: so doth a little folly, him that is in reputation for wisdom and honor, *Eccles.* 10. 1. *A very little of any thing that is but a kin to scurrility will make an ingenious person disgust and nauseat the most learned book. Dr.* Crakanthorp *hath very solidly confuted* Spalatensis, *but the uncivil language he every where useth against the Archbishop,*

bishop, hath sometime turned my stomach, and made me leave off reading. Dr. Abbot *hath most judiciously defended the* Reformed Catholick *against* William Bishop, *but when I find him calling* Wright, foul-mouthed dog, when, *&c. I cannot but wonder where a man that had all his dayes been bred up among Scholars, learn'd such language. As for Bishop* Mountague *he boasts*, that never any had handled the Papists as he had done, *and I verily believe him; his Gag is a piece for which he may well be denominated a Adarchists Scoffer.* Fool, Goose, Cockscomb, Ass, Horse, Blind Buxard, Poor Woodcock, Catholick Cockscomb, *&c. These are flowers that grow in Mr.* Mountagues *Garden: are they not very lovely & sweet? will not Popery fall to the ground after one of its Patrons hath been so bespattered with so many uncomely names? or will not the Papists rather be confirmed in Popery, when they shall observe a dignified Minister in the Protestant Church, to use such unsavoury language, without check or controul from Superiors?*

2. *I expect if any one answer me, that he faithfully relates Historical matters: for let him mistake, that I will think the worse of any party, because I find it slandered: rather I shall judge men good, because their Adversaries durst not speak evil of them, till they had first represented them to be what every man may know they were not. Lately there was Printed an History of Presbyterians, dedicated to both Houses of Parliament, and commended in the dedicatory, as being for the most part,* nothing but a faithful collection of matters of fact, transacted by the Ancestors of a Sect to this day more than enough warm in the bowels of these Kingdoms. *Let me crave leave only to say no-*

tice how this History begins. Page 1, 2. At such time as it pleased God, to raise up *Martin Luther*, a Divine of *Saxony*, to write against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*; *Ulderick Zuinglius*, a Canon of the Church of *Zurick*, endeavouring the like Reformation among the *Switzers*; but holding no intelligence with one another, they travelled divers ways in pursuance of it, which first produced some Animosities between themselves, not to be reconciled by a personal conference, which by the *Lantgrave* of *Hassia* was procured between them; but afterwards occasioned far more obstinate ruptures between the followers of the parties in their several stations. The *Zuinglian* Reformation was begun in defacing Images, decrying the established Fasts, and appointed Festivals, abolishing set Forms of Worship, denying the old Catholick Doctrine of a Real Presence, and consequently all External Reverence in the participation of the blessed Sacrament, which *Luther* seriously laboured to preserve in the same estate in which he found them at the present. They differed also in the Doctrine of Predestination, which *Luther* taught according to the current of the Antient Fathers, who lived and flourished before the writings of St. *Augustin*; so that the Romanists had not any thing to except against in that particular, when it was canvased by the Schoolmen in the Council of *Trent*. And a little after, the *Lutherans* have solemnly vowed rather to fall off roundly to the Church of *Rome*, than yeild to those Predestianarian, and Sacramentarian Resilences, as they commonly called them.

The

The Historian saith, It pleased God to raise up *Martin Luther, no such good words are used concerning the Reformation endeavoured by* Ulderick Zuinglius. *Yet* Zuinglius, *though born four years after* Luther, *opposed the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of* Rome *before* Luther, *and was doubtless of more Modesty, Humility and Learning than* Luther. *And if the differences betwixt him, and* Luther, *at the Conference procured betwixt them, and others by the* Lantgrave *of* Hassia, *could not be reconciled,* Luther *must bear the blame, who was so uncivil as to call* Bucer *Knave, and so wedded to his notion of Consubstantiation, that he declared he would not recede an hairs breadth from it, and yet had at the Conference, so little to say for it, that he lost the* Lantgrave *and his Preachers,* Francis Lambert, *who before had embraced his Doctrine in the point of the Sacrament. Yet dare not I say with the Dr.* That Animosities betwixt *Luther* and *Zuinglius* were produced not to be reconciled by a personal Conference, which by the *Lantgrave* of *Hassia* was procured betwixt them. *For first I am not sure that any personal Conference was ever procured betwixt* Luther *and* Zuinglius at Marpurg, *indeed* Oecolampadius *and* Luther *had personal Conference in private, so also had* Melanchton *and* Zuinglius. *No Conference had* Luther *and* Zuinglius *that I read of, unless for three days in publick, in which three days, though* Luther *alone spake for his party,* Melanchton, Brentius, Osiander, Agricola *being with* Luther, *yet* Zuinglius, *but* Oecolampadius *answered him, and disputed against him: and thinks it like the Dr. calls personal Conference, whether properly or no, is a question. But that I blame him for,*

is

is this, that he saith, that the Animosities were not to be ended by that Conference; *it had been too much to say they were not ended, fourteen Articles were after that Conference subscribed by all the Divines of both parties. The fourteenth recites, how far they agreed about the Lords Supper: they agreed* it was to be received according to the institution in both Elements, and that there was no need of the Mass, to obtain grace for living or dead; and that the Sacrament of the Altar, was a Sacrament of the true Body and Bloud of Jesus Christ, and that Christians, all and every one, had most need of spiritual manducation. In like manner, that the use of the Sacrament, as the word was appointed, that weak Consciences might be moved by the spirit to true Faith and Love. *This was all they differed in*, whether the true Body and Bloud of Christ were corporally in the Bread and Wine: *about this they could not agree in opinion, but yet they agreed* to exercise mutual charity, and to pray for one another, and to leave off writing against one another. *So that the Animosities were ended. And some think, that had he the raging of that Pestilential disease, called* Anglicus Sudor, *put an end to the Conference, the very difference in opinion as to the Sacrament had been made an end of. But let us go on with the Dr.*

The *Zuinglian* Reformation, was begun in defacing Images, decrying the established Fasts, and appointed Festivals, abolishing set Forms of Worship, denying the old *Catholick* Doctrine of a Real Presence, and consequently all External Reverence in the participation of the blessed Sacrament.

When

When the Historian saith, that the Zuinglian *Reformation began in defacing Images, the Reader will be apt to think that defacing Images was the first fruit of* Zuinglius *his Reformation; but if he should so think, he would be mistaken:* Zuinglius *his Reformation began in Preaching of the Word at* Zurich, *whither he came* Anno 1519. *leaving another place in which he had a larger stipend than he could there expect,* (N. B. *Both the* Helvetian *and* German *Reformer agreed in this, that neither cared for Gold, or sought great Livings*) *he laid the foundation also of Reformation in encouraging the study of the learned Languages, the neglect whereof brought in Popery. It was not till* Zuinglius *had been five or six years Preacher at* Zurick, *that Idols and Images were burnt in the Market place. And being then burnt by publick Authority, what was there in the fact that deserved not praise? is it not commendable in Christian Magistrates, after they have heard it proved by their Divines that Images are not to be suffered in Churches, or other places of publick resort, and when none either could, or would say any thing, for the retaining of them, to take them away, that so they may be no further temptations to Idolatry. As much as this was appointed to be done in our* English *Reformation, why is it not done in the* Lutheran *Churches we shall by and by hear.*

It is added by the Historian, that the Zuinglian *Reformation* did begin in decrying the established Fasts, & appointed Festivals. *If the meaning of this be, that* Zuinglius *decried the multitude of Fasts, and Festivals, appointed to be observed, by the* Church *of* Rome, *or that he condemned the necessity and meritoriousness, which the Papists ascribed to the observation of*

Fasts

Fasts and Feasts, if it is true, and tends to the commendation of Zuinglius; *but that he decryed every established Fast, or appointed Feastival, is a most notorious slander.*

So is it also, that his Reformation began in the abolishing of set Forms of Worship, unless the meaning be, that he procured the abolition of some forms of worship, set by the Papists as Papists, and if an Historian after he hath told us that a man abolished set forms of Worship may be allowed to interpret himself of Popish Idolatrous forms of Worship, then may we think, he hath no mind to be understood, and without any blame at all, neglect him.

It follows, the Zuinglian *Reformation began in the denying of the old Catholick Doctrine of a Real Presence.*

This charge must be intended of Zuinglius *his denying the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and if it be so intended, it is as false as what is most false.* Zuinglius *had been at* Zurick *five years, and reformed many things before he let any one know his mind about the Sacrament, and perhaps before he knew his own mind as to the manner of Christs presence in, or with the Sacramental Elements. When he after long study discovered his mind about this matter, he never denyed a Real Presence, unless by Real Presence he understood a Corporal Presence. He expounded* Hoc est Corpus meum, *by a Trope, so did our Reformers in* England. *He thought the Bread was the Body of Christ Representatively, and as our King may be, and is said to be really present, where there is any one who by his own Authority is appointed to represent him: so the Body of Christ may be said to be really present*

ent where there is an Element appointed by himself to represent his Body. And if Dr. Heylin *did opine that the Body which our Lord Jesus united to his Divine Nature, and with which he ascended into Heaven, be any other way present in the Eucharist, he both erred and discented from that Church in which he was bred up.*

For a conclusion, the Historian tells us, that the Zuinglian *Reformation began in denying all External Reverence in the participation of the Blessed Sacrament.*

Words more strange than any that we had before: For what is meant by The Blessed Sacrement? *Sure the Dr. was so much a Christian, as to acknowledge at least, two Blessed Sacraments; if so, which of these two would he have us to understand by the Blessed Sacrament? Baptism, or the Lords Supper? I know not why the later, should rather be called, the Blessed Sacrament, than the former, nor why more External Reverence is necessary in the participation of this, than of that, supposing the Recipient to be adult. If a converted* Jew *should come to be Baptised, why is he not as well bound to kneel when he is sprinkled with water, as when he takes the Bread and Wine. As for* Zuinglius, *he never denied External Reverence in the Participation of the Blessed Sacrament of the Lords Supper; the mode and form in the which he first administred it, is recited in* Melchior Adam, *and in the* Historia Sacramentaria de Cœnâ Domini, *and in it all needful Reverence was used. But perhaps not to make the Communicants receive the Sacred Elements on their knees, is to deny all External Reverence in the participation of the Eucharist; if so, Christ and all his Churches for*

some

some Centuries must also be affirmed to have denied all External Reverence.

By this it appears what false witness the Dr. hath born against Zuinglius; *doth he bear a truer witness concerning* Luther? *of him these words are said,* —which *Luther* seriously laboured to preserve in the same estate in which he found them at the present. *Words that either are senseless, or very untrue; if they have any sense, it must be this, that* Luther *seriously endeavoured to preserve the things before mentioned, in the same estate in which he found them in the Papacy. This sense the words do not afford; but if we suppose that this sense was intended, I then say nothing more false could have been written.* Luther *did not seriously endeavour to preserve anyone thing before mentioned in the condition in which he found it.*

1. *For Images, he was indeed angry that they were taken down, not because he desired or endeavoured to have them kept up, but because he would have had the honor of pulling them down, and could not endure, that* Carolostadius *should adventure to make any alteration in his absence, yet* Carolostadius *excused* Luther, *Doctor, and made not the alteration on his own head, but with true consent and advice of* Melancthon *and others.*

2. *As to Fasts and Festivals set and constant,* Luther *had as little fondness for them as* Zuinglius *could have, might he have ruled the rest, no Holy days had been kept but the Lords day. To be sure, he endeavoured not after he thought of Reformation, to keep in his Fasts or Festivals in the same State in which he found them, he looked not on them as parts of Worship.*

3. *He defended a not only Real, but also a Corporal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; but not,* the Ancient

tient Catholick Doctrine of Real Presence, *nor yet*, the new *Roman* Catholick Doctrine of Real Presence, *finding in an eminent Schoolman*, that were it not for the Authority of the Church, he should more incline to Consubstantiation than Transubstantiation, Luther *bethought himself that he had abandoned the Authority of that Church which kept* Cameracensis *in awe, and so boldly maintained Consubstantiation (though not to his dying day as some think.) Happy had it been for his followers, if so absurd an opinion had never been published by him, for they counting themselves concerned to maintain whatsoever he in his fierce oppositions to* Zuinglius *delivered, are fallen into the most monstrous tenent of Ubiquity, which whoever believeth with all the necessary consequences, cannot believe one quarter of the* Apostles Creed. *But what is the External Reverence in the use of the Lords Supper affirmed by* Lutherans *and denied by* Zuinglianists. *Adoration is by the* Lutherans *condemned as well as by the* Zuinglianists, *so is Asservation, and Circumgestation*; Luther *himself somewhere, if* Wendelin *abuse him not, advised Christians to Receive in one Kind, or Element where they could not Receive in both, but the* Lutherans *stiffly contend for the necessity of receiving* sub utraque Specie. *The differences not already taken notice of, are*;

1. *The* Lutherans *think more favourably of Stone Altars, than do the* Zuinglianists.

2. *The* Lutherans, *at least many of them, better approve of lighting Candles in the Administration, than do* Zuinglianists. *We in* England *in many places set Candles and Candlesticks on the Tables, but do not light the Candles.*

3. *The* Lutherans *use for one Element, a* placenta orbicularis, *of which it may be questioned whether it can properly be called bread: so do not the* Zuinglianists.

4. *The* Lutherans *use no breaking of the Bread, so do* Zninglianists.

5. *The* Lutherans *give not that which they use for Bread into the hands of the Communicants, but put it into their mouths, so do not the* Zuinglianists.

In no needful point of External Reverence do they differ: But perhaps in point of Predestination, Luther *and* Zuinglius *were at deadly strife and variance: so indeed the Historian suggests, for these are his words;* Predestination *Luther* taught according to the current of the Antient Fathers which lived and flourished before the writings of St. *Austin. But by his favor,* Luther *taught Predestination as St.* Austin *and the Fathers that followed him taught it, had he taught it as the Fathers before him taught it, he had in words at least complied with the wretched* Pelagians. *Other Predestination did* Zuinglius *never teach. So that* Zuinglius *and* Luther *differed not about Predestination, and the late* Ubiquitarian Lutherans, *make a difference where they found none.*

Ob. *But have not the* Lutherans *solemnly vowed rather to fall off roundly to the Church of* Rome *than yeild to the Predestinarian and Sacramentarian Pestilences?* *Dr.* Heylin *ibid.*

An. *That some Lutherans have used words of such an import I remember is affirmed by Sir* Edwin Sands: *But to say the* Lutherans *have solemnly vowed to turn Papists rather than imbrace* Zuinglius *his opinion about Predestination and the Sacrament, is an untruth of such a bulk as most men but Dr.* Heylin *would have strained at.*

When

When did the Lutherans *solemnly vow this? what Record is there of any place where such a vow was made? or what ground had the* Lutherans *to enter into such a solemn vow? Till these questions can be well answered, which will never be, we might, if we did not reverence the Drs. degree well, be allowed to say* mentitur Petrus. *But to give any man such language is so troublesome, that I heartily pray I may never have to do with any, who will give me any such temptation.*

3. *I do also expect that he who will answer me, should have so much Logick, and Metaphysicks, as to be able to understand the terms of the Questions, and the state of the Questions agitated in the book, and rightly to form Arguments* pro & con. *For let not any one imagin, that I will be at the trouble to teach him that in Print, which he should have learn'd of his Tutor. Once indeed I did stoop so low, as to inform Mr:* Tho: Pierce, *that* real *and* possitive *were not the same, and that* The absence of a form from the subject in which it ought to have been, though it were never in it actually, may be called a privation, *and* That death is a privation notwithstanding Christ came to destroy it: *and* That the generation of one thing is the corruption of another thing, not formally but only by concomitance: *and that our* English *word* Sin, *is not a concrete, but an abstract term: and that* one accident may be the subject of inhesion to another accident, though not the ultimate subject. *But that imployment did so little please me, and I had so little thanks for it, that I am almost resolved never to take it upon me more. Yet this I must needs say for the excuse of my first confident Antagonist, that he is not the only man that adventured to fight before he either knew*

how to form his weapon, or to make use of it. Dr. Heylin *whom the Bishops were wont alway to send out upon the forlorne hope, had written many books of Controversie, before he knew the nature of a conditional Syllogism, as appears from the marvellous check he gives Mr.* Baxter *for saying after a conditional major,* But the Antecedent is true. *Ergo,* so is the Consequent. *Such a form of arguing it seems the Dr had never read, nor heard of, yet I believe every Freshman hath heard of it, and knows the reason of it. Another, that went for a learned man, brings an Argument that he thought unanswerable;* viz. *Babylon* as *Babylon* is not a visible Church of Christ, But *Babylon* is *Babylon* as it is *Babylon.* Therefore *Babylon* is not a Visible Church of Christ. *Not knowing it seems, that in such kind of Syllagismes the Reduplicative particle ought alway to be put to the major term of the Syllogism. But of all men, commend me to the* Author of the Appeal to *Casar. Some it seems offended at his Gag, had accused him for saying* there ever was and will be a Church unto whom complaints may be made. *This accusation his great stomach could not digest, but observe, good Reader, how he strains to get rid of it: doth he in his Appeal go about to prove that the Church is always so visible, as that complaints may be made to her? No: But* Appeal page 134. *he saith, that in the nineteenth Article of our Church,* Church and Visible are convertible terms. *A position so absurd, that no one who knows what convertible terms do mean, can choose but see its absurdity. But* page 139. *he grows more bold and confident (yet not so bold as to prove the proposition for which he was challenged) and in these words he swaggers.* I will yet add more Popery to the former, and so leave you my

my Friends and Informers to chew the cud on it, as they did after Lectures.

The Church of Rome *hath ever been Visible.*

The Church of Rome *is, and ever was a true Church since it was a Church.*

Therefore the true Church hath been Visible.

If any after Lectures do not chew the cud, i. e. meditate, they are unclean beasts, but wo be to those who must chew the cud on such food as this. The enunciation here concluded is, The true Church hath been Visible. *Which I never heard any Christian deny. But let us see how this man of learning proveth it. The Premises are* The Church of *Rome* hath ever been Visible. *(This Proposition is most false and contrary to all History)* The Church of *Rome* is, and ever was a true Church since it was a Church. *This premise is not apt to infer the conclusion, it should have been thus formed: The Church of* Rome *is the true Church, but then it had been Popish with a vengeance. Little need have the Puritans to pray,* a Montacutii Logica liberes nos Deus.

To conclude, if any one who is a Scholar, and will write like a Scholar, will be at the pains to shew me that Arminianism in the five points is not contrary to the Doctrine of St. Austin *(the hammer of Pelagianism) nor yet contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, I shall either speedily reply, or acknowledge my self his Prisoner. But if any one shall publish a book against me stuffed only with impotent railings, or malicious calumnies, I shall punish him as I have done two or three already, by not buying, not reading his book.*

It will perhaps be said, that the Papists, against whom we should unite our forces, will be too too much gratified

by one Protestants writing against another.

Ans. *I doubt not, but the Factors for Papacy, do with much delight, tell their Disciples, how those that are not in Communion with them are divided among themselves. But they should do well to make up their own breaches before they upbraid us with ours. He that scandalised at the diversity of opinions among the Reformed, shall betake himself to the* Romanists, *will leap out of the frying pan into the fire. The Papists only agree, in that in which they dare not publish how much they differ. And they then let a Popes dicision put an end to their disputes, when they can neither say, that the Pope was misinformed, or that he was not* in Cathedra, *or know not how by some distinction to evade the determination: that is, they then let the Popes reconcile them, when they have no mind to be any longer at variance. They will not deny but that there is as much difference between their* Dominicans *and* Franciscans, *their* Jansenists *and* Molinists *as there is betwixt* Calvinists *and* Arminians, *and yet they say that their Church is one, and not ours. How is this to be unridled? One* A. D. *about the beginning of King* James *his Reign, put forth a Pamphlet which he called* a Treatise of Faith, *neer the later end of which he lets us understand:* That the *Roman* Church is always one and uniform in Faith, never varying or holding any dogmatical point contrary to that, which in former times it did hold. The learned men thereof, though sometimes differing in opinion, in matters not defined by the Church, yet in matters of Faith all conspire in one. And no marvail, because they have a most convenient means to keep unity in profession of Faith, sith they do acknowledge one chief Pastor appointed

ed over them (*viz.* the Successor of St. *Peter*) to whose definitive censure in matters concerning Religion they wholly submit themselves.

The Gentlemans meaning, if I can fatham it, is, that the Romanists *are resolved to think their Church is at unity within her self, for though the members thereof have* 10000 *differences among themselves, yet those differences are not in matters of Faith, because they are resolved as soon as the Church shall decide them, never to differ more. Well, one would think that Protestants also might be at unity, because they profess they will yield to Scripture determination whatever it be: nay that the Gentleman will not grant, because, as he had told us a little before,* divers men expound the Scriptures diversly, *as if the decisions of their Church were not expounded diversly by divers, and were not as apt to be diversly expounded, as the Scriptures: And, as if they were as much at an end after they had found out the meaning of a decision made by the Pope, as we are when we have found out the meaning of the Scripture. Convince a Protestant that any one place of Scripture must needs be so understood as to assert Consubstantiation, he becomes a* Synusiast *forthwith. But when you have convinced a Papist that a decision of the Pope must needs be so interpreted as to cross his opinion, yet he will not lay down his opinion, but will say, perhaps, that the Pope did decide not as Pope, but only as a Learned man, or that it may be questioned whether he be a Pope, or whether he be infallible out of a Councel, or whether he was rightly informed of matter of fact. Suppose a* Jansenist *should thus argue; The Pope did not intend to condemn the Doctrine of* Augustine: *Therefore he did not intend to condemn the Doctrine of* Jansenius. *A* Molinist *would be*

loth to deny the Antecedent, and yet if he deny the Consequent, then hath the Jansenists *field room enough, and is as far from being proselyted, as if nothing had been determined against* Jansenism. *In the mean time it were heartily to be wished that Protestant Ministers would very sparingly in their Preaching touch upon those points wherein they differ among themselves; the day is yet to come that ever I Preached Sermon about Election or Reprobation; and I look upon it as a great affliction that I have been by the daring provocations of others put upon to write about them. I could easily have born it that* Dr. Heylin *should trample upon my self, but could not so well endure it, that for my sake the honor of some of our best Reformed Writers should be laid in the dust. If* Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza *may still be read without prejudice, and quoted in the Pulpit with due respect, If I can but perswade young Scholars that those who composed our Articles did understand them, and would not enjoyn men to recant such tenents as were agreeable to them, then have I obtained what I principally aimed at. And so good Reader, I commend thee to the love of God, and to the hatred of Popery and Superstition, and every opinion that hath a natural tendency thereunto.*

H. H.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Part the First.

AN Introduction, giving an account of the undertaking. Page 1, 2.

Of the Blasphemy of Florinus, *and whether* Eusebius *charge* Blastus *with it.* p. 3.

Irenæus *his Arguments against* Florinus. p. 4

The Arguments of other Fathers against his Blasphemy. p. 5.

Of the Libertines *and* Calvin. p. 6, 7.

Of Mr. Archers *Book and its burning.* p. 8.

Of Manes, Bardesanes, Colarbas, Priscillianus, p. 9, 10, 11, 12.

Luther *no Manichee.* p. 12, 13.

Calvin *no* Bardesanist, *nor* Priscilianist. p. 14, 15, 16.

Of Socinus *denying God, Prescience, and the Tessaris* scientia media. p. 17, 18, 20.

Of Pelagius *his Heresie*, &c. p. 21, 22, 23.

Of the Semipelagians. p. 24, 25.

The Arminians *follow* Pelagians, Semipelagians, Calvin, Austin. p. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.

Of Codescalk. p. 33, 34, 35, 36.

Of

Of the Council of Trent. p. 36,37,38,39,40.
Of the Condemnation of Jansenius. p. 41,42,43, 44,45,46.

Part the Second.

THE *Opinion of the* Piedmont *Churches concerning Predestination and Grace.* p. 353,354.
Of the Augustan *Confession, by whom made.* p. 355. *not relished by the Papists,* 356. *drawn up in haste,* 357. *subscribed by* Calvin *and* Zanchy, p. ibid.
Melancthon *not against* Calvin *in the point of Predestination,* p. 357, *to* 361. Luther *retracted not his book* de servo arbitrio, 362. *An Article of the Confession explained,* p. 362, 363.
Of the Liber Concordiæ, p. 364,365.
Of the Conference between Beza *and* Andræus. p. 366,367.
Calvin *not proved to make God the author of sin,* p. 369,370,371. *of his horrible Decretum,* 372,373. *Reprobation, as stated by him, not of such reproach among Papists, nor of such sence among the* Lutherans *as the Dr. pretends,* 374, *to* 377. *justified as to* Castalio, 377, 378. *no* Superlapsarian, *at least not the first,* 378,379.
Of the different opinions concerning the object of Predestination, 379.
Supralapsarians *abused by the Dr.* 380,381.
Sublapsarian *Opinion stated out of the Synod of* Dort, *and the answers to Mr* Hords *objections against,* 382, *to* 396.
Of the Remonstrants *&* Arminians, 397, *to* 408.

The

The Drs. Parallel betwixt the Synod of Dort *and the Council of* Trent *disproved*, 408, to 416.
The Remonstrants *not used cruelly*, 41[illegible].
God made the Author of sin by those who charge others to make him such, 419, 420, 421.
The City of Sedan *abused*, 422, 423.
Episcopius *his humor described*, 423, 424.
The Remonstrants *cannot join with any Christian Church*, 424.
The charge against the Remonstrants *made good*, 425, to 429.
Whether their Opinions tend to Popery, 429, to 433.
How far chargeable with faction, 434, to 436.
Wickliffe *defended*, 438, to 445.
Tindal, Barnes, Frith *justified & commended*, ibid.
Dr. Heylins *mistakes about our Reformation and Reformers in* England *rectified*, 446, to 452.
The English *Article about Predestination laid down, and its sense*, 453, to 455. *The Historians Observations therefrom considered & confuted*, 456, to 458.
Of the Liturgy, 459, 460. *K.* Edw. *Catechism*, ibid.
Of the Judgment of our Martyrs, Mr. Rogers, 461, 462. *As* Cranmer Ridley, 462, 463. Philpot, 465. Bradford, 465, to 469.
Of Peter Martyr *and* Bucer, 469, to 472.
Of the Geneva *Bible*, ibid.
Hooper *and* Latimer *no Frinds to* Arminianism, 473, 474.
Calvins *Reprobation misrepresented by Dr.* H. 475.
as also his Doctrine concerning Perseverance, 477.
Of the sixteenth Article of our Church, 478, to 483.
Calvinists *no new Gospellers*, 484, 485.
Of Compneys, Veron, Crowley 486, 487.

Of

Of Queen Elizabeths *Articles*, 488,489.
Of Mr. Nowels *Catechism*, 490,491,492.
Queen Elizabeths *Homilies*, 492,493.
Of Mr. Harsnet, *of Bishop* King, 494,495.
Of Mr. Fox *his Martyrology vindicated*, 496.
Mr. Perkins *cleared*, 499,500.
Of Whittaker, Barro, Barret 502, *&c.*
Of the Lambeth *Articles*, 505,506.
Of the Questions and Answers put betwixt the Old and New Testament in former Bibles, 507.
Of the Hampton-Court *Conference*, 510.
Of the Irish *Articles*, 512.
A Catalogue of Bishops preferred by K. James, 514.
Of Overall, Vorstius, *our Divines at the Synod of Dort*, Sympton, Tompson, *K.* James *his directions*, Bridges, Mountague, 514, *to the end.*

N. B. *The Second Part through the Printers mistake is all along mispaged.*

HISTORIA

ERRATA.

Page 17. line 23. read *thing*. l. 34. r. *Smalcius*. p. 20. l. 15. r. *that he decrees*. l. 34. *fore-knowledge*. p. 22. l. 9. r. *perseverens*. p. 23. l. 27. r. *saperet*. l. 36. *parvo*. p. 26. l. 23. after *charge*, r. *we must now make some easie enquiry; as to the first charge*. p. 27. l. 7. r. *utraque*. l. 23. *quod adjutorio*. p. 28. l. 4. r. *proferuntur*. p. 29. l. 5. r. *whence*. p. 31. l. 16. r. *the point of*. p. 40. l. 6. r. *he had*. l. 29. *Calovichus*. *Catharinus*. p. 359. l. 14. r. *arcana*. l. 24. *rogatum*. p. 360. l. 12. r. *both*. l. 35. r. *two*. p. 363. l. 11. r. *flagitiis*. p. 367. 5. r. *Ut*. l. 6. *mundi*. p. 370. l. 37. r. *disertis*. p. 381. l. 24. r. *for want of it*. p. 184. l. 27. r. *viz*. p. 185. l. 22. r. *yea*. p. 395. l. 13. r. *addictus*. p. 409. l. 11 r. 55. p. 410. l. 11. r. *Salisbury*. p. 426. l. 21. r. lucet. p. 433. l. 10. r. *leave*. p. 434. l. 31. r. *determination*. p. 437. l. 28. r. *and Composers*. p. 444. l. 1. r. *than*. p. 446. l. 5. dele *is*. p. 451. l. 20. r. *Arianism*. l. 33. *off from*. p. 455. l. 36. r. *Post destination*. p. 459. l. 30. r. *wherein*. p. 460. l. 7. r. *to*. p. 462. l. 26. r. *ultimum*. l. 27. *Suffolciensem*. l. 36. *praeterit*. p. 470. l. 15. r. *of*. p. 473. l. 2. r. *Arianism*. p. 480. l. 23. r. *recovered*. p. 482. l. 40. r. *I only*. p. 483. l. 34. r. *than*. p. 493. l. 29. r. *to sin*. p. 494. l. 40. r. *him the*. p. 500. l. 2. r. *ratified*. p. 502. l. 12. r. *that the*. p. 505. l. 31. r. *bearing them*. l. 36. *letter to*. 506. l. 12. r. *or something*. l. 22. *did he bring* p. 509. l. 3. r. *prefacing*. l. 12. *there were*. p. 510. l. 16. r. ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ p. 506. l. 7. r. *his*

ERRATA.

HISTORIA
Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata;
OR
ANIMADVERSIONS
ON
Dr. Heylins
QUINQUARTICULAR
HISTORY.

IT is an happiness rather to be wished, than hoped for, that the Church of God should stand in need of no *Polemical Divines*, for whilst Sathan is Sathan, and Men Men, and whilst the Righteous Judge of all Mankind sees meet to punish those who *receive not the truth in the love of it*, by giving them up to *strong delusions*, there will be Hereticks *wresting the Scriptures*, and opposing the *Faith once*

 deliver-

delivered to the Saints. Against these, as many as had any regard of mens precious and immortal souls, have in all Ages thought themselves obliged to contend earnestly, and that with two sorts of weapons: The first *Apodictical*, proving the truth, and refelling the errors opposite to it, by evidence of Scriptures, and strength of Reason: the second Historical, confirming Truth by the Testimonies and Authority of men renowned for Learning and Piety. The former are the weapons *mighty through God to the throwing down of strong holds*, but the later have also been used with good success; and indeed he must be a perfect stranger to all modesty and humility, who doth hastily embrace any assertion opposed by all, as the greatest part of the *Fathers*, *Martyrs* and *Reformers* of the Church. With these later Weapons I intend (he assisting *who worketh in us both to will and to do*) to encounter the *Reverend Doctor Peter Heylin*, thought it seems by the many importunate Letters sent to him, as able as any to strengthen the weak hands of *Arminius*, and his followers. I do in the entrance promise to have in my eye that golden saying, *Historici primum munus est, ne quid falsi dicere audeat: deinde ne quid veri non audeat; ne qua suspicio gratiæ sit in scribendo, ne qua simultatis*, which that the Doctor observed not, will be evident before I have done, to all but those who cannot, or will not see. Our Subject must be the unhappy *Quinquarticular Controversie*, about which the Doctor had written something in that part of his *Certamen Epistolare*, which was directed against Mr. *Hickman*: That *Certamen* whether it pleased others or no, it seems pleased the Doctor himself so well, that he hath thought meet to repeat a good part of it in his *Historia Quinquarticularis*, and that without begging pardon for his Tautology; but this being a fault against my purse rather than against the Truth, I can easily forgive, and shall make some Animadversions on his History, and insert such Digressions, as I shall judge meet to decide the Controversie, whether the Remonstrant or Contra-Remonstrant opinions be most agreeable to the sense of the Antient and Modern Reformed Protestant Churches, more especially this of *England*; if I evince not that the Contra-Remonstrant are, I refuse not the *hardest Censure*.

The

The Doctor in this first Chapter makes some declamatory attempts against such, "As have either made God the Author "of sin, or denied the liberty of mans will, or attributed too "much to the natural freedom of mans will, in the works of "piety; whether with that fidelity and candor that becomes an Historian must now be examined.

Lib. 1. pag. 2. *The Blasphemy which makes God to be the Author of sin, was first broach'd in terms expresse, by* Florinus, Blastus, *and some other of the City of* Rome *about the year* 180, *encountred profoundly by that Godly Bishop and Martyr St.* Irenæus, *who published a Discourse against them, bearing this Inscription,* περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν ποιητὴν τῆς κακίας *that God was not the Author of sin.* For this he refers us to *Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 14. & 19. and to no other Author.

Periculosum est in limine offendere; 'Tis ominous to stumble at the very Threshold, so hath the Doctor done. For though I can easily grant that *Florinus* did in *terminis* assert God to be the Author of sin, partly because of the Title of the Epistle written to him, which is, περὶ μοναρχίας, ἢ περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν ποιητὴν τῆς κακίας, partly because I find him by *Irenæus* in a fragment of an Epistle to him, recorded in *Eusebius lib.* 5. *cap.* 19. charged to maintain such Dogmata, as ἃ οὐδὲ ἀξιοῖ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος ἐνθυμούμενος ἀποφαίνεσθαι word, Heretick out of the Church durst never hold, yet is there not the least proof from *Eusebius* (what ever there may be from others) that *Blastus* ever maintained any such blasphemy. From the Title of the Epistle written to him, which is περὶ μοναρχίας, we may guess that his opinions were such as had a tendency to *Schism*, rather than to any any thing which is properly *Heresie*. *Tertullian* towards the end of his Book *de Heresibus*, writes thus of him: Blastus *latenter Judaismum cultui introducere*; Pascha *enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse nisi secundum legem* Moysi 14. Mensis; *quin autem vesciat quoniam Evangelica gratia evacuatur, si ad legem Christum religat.* *Fessardentius* in his Preface to some fragments of *Irenæus*, saith, it may be easily collected from several Antients, whom he there names, that *Blastus* gave the beginning to the Schism of the *Quartodecimani*; this is all peculiar to *Blastus* that, I can find, though it is scarce to be doubted, but that he held some of the absurd opinions of *Valentinus*, whose Scholar he was. I only add, if *Florinus* an hearer of *Polycarp*, and a Presbyter of *Rome*, fell into the highest and

most horrid of Blasphemies, no one hath reason to be secure, but every one that stands, had need take heed lest he fall into the same sury, or by running from it, fall into same dotage, as contrary to Scripture. For so I find that a Sect of men called by *Austin Colothiani*, (by *Isidore* corruptly *Cotiliani*, and more corruptly by *Platina Quolisiani*) from *Colobus* a Presbyter of the Church of *Alexandria*, did, not doubting to assert that God did not Create any sort of evil: whereas he could not be God, if he did not work all evils that are in Cities or Countries, so far as they are the fruits and just rewards of mens sins. This error saith *Epiphanius* ἐν ἐπιμονῇ καὶ ὀξύτῃ, &c. lasted not long, but soon vanished; yet because it is so expressly mentioned by *Philaster*, *Danæus* conceives it spread it self both into East and West; certain I am, the *Arminian* if closely followed, must either fall into this pit, or else depart from some of his beloved opinions.

D. H.

"*Ibid.* What Arguments the good Father used to cry down "this blasphemy, I cannot gather from any Author, but such "they were so operative, and effectual in stopping the cur-"rent of the mischief, that either *Florinus*, and the rest had no "followers at all, or such as never attained to the height of "of their Masters influence.

Answer. What the good Fathers Arguments were, is not so impossible to be Collected out of *Eusebius*, as the Doctor here suggests; For though it be but a very fragment of the Epistle to or against *Florinus*, which is come to our hand, yet out of that fragment we may gather something, that *Irenæus* thought meet to make use of, namely that *Florinus* his *Dogma* was ἀσύμφωνον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, not agreeable to the sentiment of the Church of God that then was, that is, did, τοὺς φιλοδοξοῦντας ἀποδιδράσκειν εἰς μεγίστην ἀσέβειαν, deny, as many as did embrace it, into the greatest impiety; 'tis also farther added there by *Irenæus*, that he had very perfect remembrance of *Polycarpe* who conversed with St. *John*, and that he could witness as in the presence of God, that had that blessed and Apostolical Presbyter (so he calls *Polycarpe*, not Bishop) heard any such thing as was by *Florinus* asserted, he would have stopped his ears, and cryed aloud, according to his cu-

stom,

stom, ὦ καλὰ γε, &c. *Good God, mark what times hast thou kept me that I should hear such things!* yea, that he would forthwith have fled out of that place, lest which either standing or sitting he had heard any such impiety which considerations undoubtedly do not want their weight, at least they are as material as any brought by Dr. *Heylin* himself. Upon this occasion it may not be amiss to mention the Arguments by which, if not *heretics*, yet other of the Antient Fathers have opposed this (not undeservedly called) *Doctrine of Devils*, that *God is the Author of sin.*

1. They laid some stress upon this, that *sin* is not *positive*, but *privative*. This Argument is largly prosecuted by *Dionysius*, commonly (though falsly) call'd the *Areopagite*: he proveth that Moral evil cannot be from God, because it is παρὰ τὸ σύμφορον, παρὰ τὴν φύσιν, παρὰ τὴν ἀιτίαν, παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν, παρὰ τὸ τέλος, ἀπὸ τὴν ὑπόστασιν. Much more of this nature may be seen in Mr. *Hick: Justification of the Fathers and Schoolmen*, and therefore if any (which God forbid) should be minded to lick up the vomit of *Florinus*, Mr. T. P. by maintaining the positivity of sin, hath encouraged them so to do; but the best is, his *Impartial enquiry into the Nature of sin*, is so managed, that one may say to him, as once *Gualter Haddon* did to *Hieronymus Osorius*, *Video Thrum tuum constare ex ignorantiâ, & impudentiâ, quarum vel cum sim, ut nihil intelligas, alter? tamen efficitur, ut omnia impeas.* There's one continued fallacy runneth through all his Pages, the confounding of the materialum or substratum, and the formale of sin; he that can distinguish these (as who cannot that hath but dipped into a *System* of *Metaphysics*) hath answered all his reasons, all his Authorities.

2. *Basil* and others, argue from the Nature of God, unto which *Holiness* and *Righteousness* are essential, and therefore sin so contrary to it, cannot be caused by it.

3. The Fathers much urge the reason drawn from the last Judgment, in which God is to punish all the impenitent, for their ungodliness: *Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? God forbid, for then how shall God Judge the World?* Rom. 3. 5, 6. God could have no mind to punish that which he himself caused, nor could he justly punish man for doing that which he had made him to do, ἔξω τῆς κοινῆς ἐννοίας τοῦ γεγονότος ποιήσας τὸν κολάζειν, As *Nissen* excellently.

But it is time that I should pass to that Age, in which the Heresie of *Florinus* buried (as the Doctor thinks) for so many Centuries, was revived; of that, thus he begins. Pag. 2. *It never revived in more than thirteen hundred years after the death of* Irenæus, *when it was again started by the Libertines, a late brood of Sectaries.*

Answer. If the Doctor here speak of those that did by just and necessary consequence make God the Author of sin, there were many betwixt *Irenæus* and the two Tailors of *Flandria*, that did so, but he would have us think that the Libertines did *Καθ' ὁμολογίαν* in express terms entitle God to be the sins of all men, he must pardon us, if we be not too hasty in so thinking. For *Bellarmine* who possibly read over the History of the *Libertines* with as much care as the Doctor, tells us expressly, that the *Libertines do in words deny, that they make God the Author or cause of sin, de Statu peccati, lib. 2. cap. 2.* The truth is, their Tenent rather was, that *there is no sin*, than that *God is the cause of sin.* They would not deny but that God wrought all the Adulteries and Rapines that were, but then they affirmed that Adulteries and Rapines being wrought by God, were no sins: But under whose Wings were these miscreants hatched; and when did they first infect the Christian Church?

Page 3. *The time of their breaking out affirmed to be about the year 1529. Founders of the Sect* Coppinus, *and* Quintinus *Flemmings both, and this* Prateolus *affirms for certain to be the Progeny of* Calvin, *and other leading Men of the Protestant Churches*; Bellarmine *more remissly, omnino probabile est.*

Answer. About, is a word that will stretch, and hath sayed many a lie, yet was it no more than was needful; For so uncertain is our Historian about the time of these wretched miscreants rising, that having in these words placed it at the year 1529. a very few Lines after, he placeth it at *Anno* 1527. but his Friend *Prateolus* placeth it lower yet, at the year 1525. at which time Mr. *Calvin* was not much above sixteen years old, being born, if he who writes his Life deceive me not, the sixth of *June* Anno 1509. and therefore it would be a most strange oversight in *Prateolus*, if he should affirm that the Libertines were the Progeny of *Calvin*, but the truth is, *Prateolus* is guilty of no such oversight, though the Doctor is pleased to charge it upon him. There is no necessity in the World,

that

that *è Schola nostræ tempestatis Evangelicorum*, (which are *Pratcolus* his words) should take in *Calvin*. Well, the Doctor himself is not unwilling to acquit *Calvin* from being the Parent of these Libertines, and acknowledgeth, that Calvin *was not wanting to purge himself from such an odious imputation*. And I hope he hath sufficiently purged himself, if a Learned and full confutation of their opinion be a sufficient Purgation. The truth is, *Coppin* and *Quintin*, as also *Bertrand* and *Perseval* were all Papists. As for *Antonius Pocquius* (whom Dr. *Heylin* according to his mistaking faculty calls, page 3. *Franciscus Porquius*) he was undoubtedly a Romanist, and a Romanist in Orders, a *Franciscan* Fryer; it cannot be denied (nor is it) that *Porquius* was for some time at *Geneva*; and being to leave that place, he would fain have obtained Letters Testimonial and Commendatory from *Calvin*, as he had from *Martin Bucer*; but Mr. *Calvin*, though he then knew not the spirit of the man perfectly, did so shrewdly suspect him to be a Fanatick, that he would never be prevailed with to testifie any good thing on his behalf; yea when this Deceiver discovered himself, he could not forbear him, but chastised him and *Quintin* sharply, and by name, in his discourse against the Libertines, and when the Queen of *Navarre* (who though not tainted with the Libertines Errors, was bewitched with the pretended Holiness of these two chief Sticklers) took her self to be wounded through their sides, this man of God wrote to her with admirable moderation; so it was meet considering her dignity, and the good that she had done to the Church of God; but withal, he reprehended her imprudence for admitting such men; and by this Letter he so far prevailed, that this abominable Sect which began to flock apace into *France*, afterwards kept it self in *Holland*, and the Countries adjacent. The Epistle is to be seen among *Calvins* Epistles, page 53. To conclude, I do throughly joyn with the Doctor, in detesting all those, who either directly, or by any just consequence known to them, make the Holy God the Author, or cause of all, or any sinfulness. Nor do I know any *Calvinian*, that will not without the least hesitation joyn with us both in this detestation, if there be any that will not, let him be cursed with the severest Anathema's, if he shoul publish any thing of this nature, let his Book be a Victime to *Vulcan*; as Mr. *Archers* was by the appointment of the two Houses, and of the desire of the

late Assembly of Divines; a story of which transaction it will not be amiss here to insert from Doctor *Arrowsmith's* Chain of Principles; "In the year 1645. there was published in "*London* an English Book, wherein God was expressly made "the Author of his peoples sins, though not without some li-"mitations. The Assembly of Divines then sitting at *Westmin-"ster*, took offence at this, made complaint of it to both Houses "of Parliament; they both censured the said book to be burnt, "by the hand of the Common Hangman; and the Assembly of "Divines agreed upon a Declaration, *omnino condemnante*, by "by way of detestation of that abominable and blasphemous "opinion, which was also published under that Title *July* 17. "1645. and in which we meet with these expressions among "others, that the most vile and blasphemous assertion, whereby God is avowed to be the Author of sin, hath hitherto by "the general consent of Christian Teachers and Writers both "Antient and Modern, and those as well Papists as Prote-"stants been not disclaimed only, but even detested and ab-"horred: Our common adversaries, the Papists, have hitherto "only calumniously charged the Doctrine of the Reformed "Churches with so odious a crime, (in the mean time con-"fessing that we do in words deny it, as well as they them-"selves;) now should this Book be tollerated, they might "insult over us, and publish to the world, that in the Church "of *England*, it was openly and impudently maintained, that "God is the Author of sin, then which there is not any one "point, whereby they labour in their Sermons and popular "Orations, to cast a greater *Odium*, (though most injuriously) "upon the Reformed Churches; We are not for the reve-"rence or estimation of any mans person, to entertain any "such opinions as do in the very words of them asperse the ho-"nor and holiness of God; and are by all the Churches of "Christ rejected.

Proceed we to what the Doctor saith about those who entertaining the same dreadful madness with *Florinus*, did recommend it to the world under a disguise; of these, thus he begins; *Page* 3. *Cap.* 4.

B. H.

D. H.

"Of this sort *Manes* was the first, by birth of *Persia*, and "Founder of the damnable Sect of the *Manichees*, *Anno* 278. "or thereabouts. This wretch did first excogitate two Gods, "the one good, and the other evil, both of like Eternity; "ascribing all pious actions to the one, all sins and vices to "the other, which ground so laid, he utterly deprived the will "of man of that natural liberty, of which it is by God invest-"ed; and therefore that in man there was no ability of resist-"ing sin, or not submitting unto any of these wicked actions, "which his lusts and passion offered to him. *Contendebant, "item peccatum non esse à libero arbitrio, sed a Daemone & ita "propter non posse per liberum arbitrium impedire*, as my Author "hath it.

Anfeu. Who is this Author? *Praeteolus* a *Pontifician*, who neither took great pains in examining what the Antients delivered concerning Heretics, nor was fearful of affixing to men what they never held, it had been more comely for a man of great reading, as Doctor *Heylin*, either is, or seems to be, to have referred us to *Epiphanius*, or *Cyrill* of *Hierusalem*, or *Austin*, from whom we should have taken the opinions of *Manes* with less suspicion; but seeing he hath consulted his ease more than his credit, and chosen rather to take things upon trust from *Praeteolus*, than to peruse those from whom *Praeteolus* must take what he brings, if it be truth that he brings, I shall let him enjoy his humour, and not put my self to the trouble of an enquiry, whether these furious men did affirm that sin was not from free will, though there be some passages that render it probable, that they thought that man when he sinned, did *propriâ voluntate peccare*, though withal they seem to have been of this mind, that the *voluntas male agendi* was not a thing we brought on our selves by the fall, but some thing natural to us. However, without offence, I hope the Dr. may be minded that *Manes* was not the first of this wicked sort of men; for he, first called not as *August. Urbicus*, but as *Eusebius Cubricus*, got into his hands the Books of one *Terebynthus*, who had changed his name into *Buddas*, and published them to the World, as if composed by himself, is being not likely that the World should be taken with any Books that did bear

the

the name of *Buddas*, who though pretending to be born of a Virgin, and to be able to work great feats, died not long before miserably, being thrown from an high place, and having his neck broke. Not was this *Terebynthus* or *Buddas* disciple *Scythianus*, he had got into his custody the four Books, entitled *Evangelium, Liber Capitum, Mysteriorum, Thesaurorum*, but the Books were compeseed by his Master, one *Scythianus* a *Saracen* Merchant, who to gratifie his wife lived in *Egypt*, yea *Scythianus* himself did not excogitate these two Gods, or first principles, one good, the other evil, but sucked in that absurdity from such Writings or Fragments as he had met with of *Empedocles* and *Pythagoras*, as *Socrates* tellsus, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 21. whom in this whole matter I the more confidently follow, because he faithfully alledgeth every thing out of the disputation of *Archelaus* a *Mesopotamian* Bishop, who disputed with *Manes* face to face. Wherefore seeing this is the undoubted and capital error of the *Manichees* to assert two first Principles, the one good, the other bad, I leave it to the serious consideration of our Historian, whether the opinion of Mr. *Pierce*, and the *English Divines* concerning the positivity of sin, do not border somewhat too neer that absurd blasphemy, and whether it would not sound better in the ears of Christians and Philosophers to say, that the obliquity of the sinful act is but a privation, and to be attributed to the defectible nature of the will; but the Act which is the substratum of this obliquity is positive, and to be ascribed to him who is the first and supreme Agent and Cause; and whether the admonition that *Austin* once gave to the *Manichees*, *de duabus anim. contra Manich. cap* 6. in fine, may not fitly be given to the two forementioned Authors, *ut eos sequi malent, qui omne quicquid esset, quoniam esset, in quantumque esset, ex uno deo esse praedicarent.*

D. H. Page 4, 5.

"Others not daring to ascribe all their sins and wickedness "unto God himself, imputed the whole blame thereof to the "Stars and Destinies, the powerful influence of the one, and "the irresistible Decrees of the other necessitating men to "these wicked actions, which they so frequently commit.

"Thus

"Thus we are told of *Bardesanes*, *quod fata conversationes hominum ascriberet.*

Ex. We are told of Bardesanes, but where? or by whom? in the Margin I find, *Aug. de Hæres. cap.* 25. quoted. But one would almost think that the Doctor was born under some such Planet, as did either incline or necessitate him to mistake. Nothing is by St. *Austin* said of *Bardesanes cap.* 25. indeed in *cap.* 35. The words before mentioned are found, but the Historian (if he had not written in haste) needed not have been ignorant that the Learned judge this passage to be the additament of some later Pen, and they also affirm, that it wanting in most antient Copies of St. *Austin*. *Spondanus* out of *Baronius* sticks not to affirm, that nothing was ever more strenuously opposed by *Bradesanes* than the Doctrine of *Fatality*, which he proves from the testimony of many, yea all, and from *Bradesanes* his own Dialogue of Fate written to *Antoninus* the Emperor, and Recorded by *Eusebius*, *lib. 6. de Præp. Evangelica.*

Dr. H. Ibid. Page 5.

And thus it is affirmed of Priscillianus fatalibus astris homines alligatos, *that men were thralled to the Stars, which last St.* Austin *doth report of one* Colarbus, *save that he gave the power, and influence only to the Planets.*

Answ. Of any such fatalist as *Colarbus* did I never read. In all Authors that mention him, (which I have met with) he is called *Colarbus* or *Colarbasus*, or *Bassus*: where he was born, or where he taught, by all enquiry I have not yet found, but he is commonly joyned with *Marcus*, whose Heresie was raised out of the *Greek* Alphabet, subjecting all Men and their Members to the Letters thereof, so as α and ω should rule the Head, ζ and ψ the Neck, perhaps his School-fellow *Colarbasus* thought it less irrational to subject us to the Planets. The History of *Priscillianus* is most exactly described by *Sulpicius Severus*, in whom I have read it with care and delight, and find that his Heresie did spread it self most stupendiously, so as not only multitudes of Laicks, but also sundry Bishops were carried away with it: among the rest *Hyginus* or *Igisus*, or *Adyginus*, the Bishop of *Cordoba*, and Successor to *Hosius*, though he was the very first man that set himself against it; the Heresie it self was a mixture of *Gnosticism* and *Manichaism*.

Iucim

Idacius and *Ithacius*, called in the assistance of the secular powers to suppress it, for which they are severely censured by *Sulpitius*, however the Emperor did take cognizance of the Cause, put *Priscillianus*, *Felicissimus*, *Armonius*, *Latronianus* and also *Euchrocia* (a noted woman) to death, banished *Instantius* and *Tibrianus*, into our Isle of *Sylly*; but in all the accusations brought against *Priscillianus*, I do not find him in that Author charged with Fatality, yet seeing he was wont to pray naked, and to keep night Meetings with base women; let him upon *Austins* authority pass for a Fatalist; and though he was after his death Celebrated for a Martyr, and had in such honor by his followers, as that they were wont to swear by him, yet I hope that his name is abhorred by all professing Reformation, and that nothing of Fatality hath been taught by any whom Protestants honor; the Doctor thinks otherwise, and I must see on what grounds.

Dr. H. Page 5.

"Amongst the Philosophical Heterodoxies of the *Roman* "Schools, that of the *Manichees* first revived by *Martin Luther*, "who in meer opposition to *Erasmus*, who had then newly "written a Book *de libero arbitrio*, published a Discourse *de* "*servo arbitrio*, in which discourse he not only saith that the "freedom ascribed unto the will is an empty nothing, *titulus* "*& nomen sine re*, but holds expressly, that Man is drawn no "other way than *velut in animale quiddam*, no other way than "as a senseless stock or stone.

Answ. 1. What *Christian* besides Doctor *Heylin* would have taken upon him thus *to judge before the Day of Judgement?* Had it not been censure high and hard enough to say of so eminent a Reformer, that he did write his Book *partly out of opposition to* Erasmus, but it must be also affirmed, that he did it *out of meer opposition to* Erasmus?

2. What *Scholar* besides Doctor *Heylin* would have quoted *Luther, de servo arbitrio*, and never refer so much as in his Margin to *any page*, where we may find the things that are quoted out of him, and examine their coherence with passages antecedent and consequent.

3. As to the thing it self, *servum arbitrium*, is no false Divinity, *voluntas humana non est libera, antequam liberetur*, in the first

first conversion a man is *passive, as passive as a stone is in receiving the impression or signature that is made on it*; the liberty of the will discovers it self in its actings, not in its passions or receivings. I hope the Doctor holds that the Image of God in which the first man was Created, was distinct from the faculties of the soul, if he do not, then must he hold, that when Adam lost the Image of God, he also lost the faculties of his soul, which is contrary to reason and experience. If he do hold it distinct, I would fain know whether the Will were not passive in receiving that Image, whether it did not the least cooperate, towards the production of it? if it did not, it is certainly it did not; why may not this Image be again restored, the Will not cooperating to the first restitution, and yet its liberty not be diminished? is it any absurdity to say that a man is dead, *i. e.* void of spiritual life, before he is quickened; or that a man is senseless till he have his spiritual sense given him? yet do not I think that *Luther* was ever in such a height or heat of passion, as to say, that Gods working on the soul is in all things like to our working on a stone. *Similitudes do not run on all four*, as the Proverb is; when I draw a stone, no internal change is wrought on the stone, I destroy not their qualities that unfit it for motion, not do I put into it any qualities that may fit it for motion; but when God doth *out of stones raise up Children unto* Abraham, he makes them cease to be stones, *he taketh away the heart of stone, and gives them hearts of flesh*; he makes them a *willing people*, puts into them a *new Nature*, and *a new motive faculty*, and so they run unto, and follow after Christ as readily and cheerfully as the child follows the Parent from whom he expects good things. Well, but *Luther* is beholding to the Doctor, for though he have given him this shrewd knock, yet at last he gives him a stroke, as *Bellarmine* had done before, intimating his recantation of his rigorous opinion, *Page 6. Luther afterwards confirmed his judgment in this point, unto that of* Melanchton, *as appears by the* Augustan *Confession, in drawing up whereof he is acknowledged to have had a principal hand.* Let us hear him rant against *Calvin*,

Dr.

Dr. H. Page 6.

"*Calvin* will revive the errors of *Bradesants* and *Priscillian*, "in charging all mens wicked actions on the Stars and Desti-"ny, not positively and *in terminis*, I must needs say that, but "so that he comes up close to them to *tantamount*, ascribing "that to the inevitable Decrees of Almighty God, which *Bra-"desants* attributed to the power of Fate, *Priscillian* to the in-"fluence of Stars, for if God *before all Eternity* (as they plain-"ly say) did purpose and decree the fall of *Adam*, *ut ipsi de-"cretum posuerit* Adam, *Cal. Inst. lib.* 3. *c.* 23. *Sect.* 7. There "was in *Adam* a necessity of committing sin, because the Lord "had so decreed it; if without consideration of the sin of "man he hath by his determinate sentence ordained so many "millions of men to everlasting damnation, and that too ne-"*cessario & inevitabiliter*, as they please to phrase it, he must "needs preordain them to sin also, there being (as themselves "confess) no way unto the end but by the means.

Answ. This is an heavy charge, and had need be well and clearly proved, or else the Dr. will be thought to have little of that, which is the *bond of perfection*, *Charity*: Let us examine his proofs, the conclusion he is to infer is this, *that* Calvin *doth ascribe all mens wicked actions to the inevitable Decrees of Almighty God*; what are his premises? he is no *Syllogistical* man, and therefore I will not tie him to the strict rules of argumentation, but examine what he saith as I find it, *if God before all eternity (as they plainly say) did purpose and decree the fall of* Adam, *there was in* Adam *a necessity of sinning, because the Lord had so decreed it.*

Who are these *they*? before there no mention of any one save *Calvin*, is he now multiplied into these two, *John*, *Calvin*, as once *Luther* was into *Martin*, and *Luther*?

2. How doth these *John*, *Calvin* say plainly, that God did before *all eternity decree*? had it been said, that he decreed before all time, or from all eternity, this had been a plain speech, but how any decree should be made before all *eternity*, which hath no beginning, that is not plain; a man had need have Dr. *Heylins* wit to understand it.

To the thing; *God did purpose and decree the fall of our Father* Adam *from all eternity*: What is the fault in this proposi-

tion?

tion? is this it, that the Decree is said to be made from all eternity? why surely there are no temporary decrees? is it that the decree of God passed upon the fall of *Adam*? certainly the decrees of the Almighty do reach every thing that hath happened, or that shall happen, be it good or evil; the very delivering of Christ into the hands of them that Crucified him is said to be, *by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*, Act. 2. 23. Well, but hence it will follow, *that there was in Adam a necessity of committing sin.* Verily a necessity in *Adam* is a phrase somewhat odd and uncouth, if the meaning of it should prove to be no more than this, that it was necessary *Adam* should fall or commit sin, I must grant this would follow, but see no imaginable absurdity in in it, imagin God had never decreed to permit the fall of *Adam*, suppose him only to have foreseen it; hence will follow, that it was necessary *Adam* should fall, but this is *necessitas infallibilitatis*, or *consequentiæ*, not *necessitas coactionis*, or *consequentiæ*. Let the Doctor prove that any other necessity follows upon the decree; let him prove that we Calvinists do fabricate any decree, necessitating and compelling *Adam* to fall, whether he would or no, and I will yield him the whole cause; but he hath farther to say, *if without consideration of the sin of man he (God) hath by his determinate sentence ordained so many millions of men to everlasting damnation, and that too necessario & inevitabiliter, as they phrase it, he must need procure them to sin, there being no way to the end, but by the means.*

Who these they are I know not, nor have any direction to find them out, but a blind one in the Margin, *v. Synod. Rem.* which I am not Scholar expert enough to make use of, if the *Synodalia Remonstrantium* be intended, why is not the page in which those words occur quoted? can the Historian imagine his Readers do so abound in leisure, as to read over a Book of so great bulk, as the *Synodalia* to find out one phrase? such an imagination is not worthy of him. To damn is a judiciary act, if any should affirm that this is without respect to, or consideration of mans sin, I'le be no patron of his. Dr. *Twisse* (who is wont to speak as high as any that ever espoused the Contra-remonstrants quarrel) though he hold, that God hath made no Law, according to which he proceeds, in giving grace unto some, and denying it unto others, yes openly and willingly, and frequently professeth in his Latine and English

works,

works, that God hath made a Law, according to which he proceeds in distribution of rewards and punishments, and according to this Law, he decreed from everlasting, to proceed in pronouncing the sentence of Salvation and damnation on mankind.

Ibid. to *Hor.* part first *page* 38. "Reprobation doth signifie "either a purpose of denying grace, or a purpose of inflicting "damnation, and such may be considered, either as touching "the act of Gods Decree, or as touching the things decreed. "As touching the things decreed, we say,

1. "That God decreed of his meer good pleasure, to deny "unto some the grace of Faith and Repentance, for the curing "of that natural impenitence and infidelity which is found in "all, without any motive cause hereunto found in one more "than in another.

2. "As touching the inflicting of damnation, we say that "God decreed to inflict damnation on some, not out of his "meer pleasure, but meerly for their final perseverance in sin "without repentance.

I shall conclude all that relates to this matter of *Manichism* and *Pradestinism* with two sayings of the Right Reverend Father in God *John Davenant* Bishop of *Salisbury*, in his answer to *Gods Love to Mankind*, the one *Page* 72. "If any shall go "about to set mans will at liberty, and to tie up short the de-"creeing and determining Will of God, as if this had not the "determining stroke amongst all possible evil actions or e-"vents which shall infallibly be, and which shall infallibly "not be, he may avoid the suspicion of *Stoicism* or *Manichism*, "but he will hardly avoid the suspicion of Atheism, for the "greater number of mens actions being wicked and evil, if these "come into act, without Gods determinate counsel and de-"cree, humane affairs are more over-ruled by mans will than "by Gods.

The other, Page 97.

"If any Writers among the Protestants have made the "Creation of the non Elect, a means by God himself subordi-"nated unto their damnation, and the damnation of such an "end aimed at and intended by God, and consequently the "means of mens damnation, (*viz.* sinful corruption, and "voluntary

"voluntary rebellion) procured or wrought by God as the "the Author of it, they deserve rather to be branded than "patronized by any indicious Divine, yet it becometh Ortho-"doxe Divines to be careful, as well in maintaining the free "and spiritual mercy of God, in giving Faith, Repentance, "and perseverance to the Elect; as in maintaining the Justice "of God in the punishment and damnation of the non-Elect, "the defenders of conditionate Predestination, may suppose "they clear themselves well in the later, but we are sure they "stick in the Semipelagian Briars as concerning the former. "For if God upon the fore sight of mens faith and persey-"rance be induced to predestinate them, Gods Predestination "is no cause at all of Faith or perseverance, or any saving "grace, this prevision not causing things, but supposing them "already produced by other causes.

Hence I might pass to the Doctors *Historiola*, concerning the *Pelagians*, but I think it not amiss to digress a little, and note something concerning another Heresie, of which he takes no notice: there have been a vile Sect of men, who robbed God of his *Præscience*, as so all future contingencies. That *Cicero* should be of this mind (as he was if we may believe St. *Austin*) is not so strange, 'tis more to be wondred at that the poor blind Heathens should think aright of God, and his attributes in any think, than that in some things they should judge amiss of them. But that any upon whom the light of the Gospel did shine, should be so absurdly impious is marveilous; yet that *Socinus* was of this mind is not denied by any, his words are plain, *prælec. cap.* 11. *Cum igitur nulla ratio, nullus Sacratum, literarum locus sit, ex quo apertè colligi possit, Deum omnia quæ fiunt, scivisse ante quam fierent, concludendum est, minime a nobis asserendam esse istam Dei præscientiam, præsertim, cum & rationes non paucæ, & Sacra Testimonia non desint unde eam plane negandam esse appareat*, of the same mind is his Scholar *Smalinus Dis.* 12. *de causâ peccati in Thes.* 3. as also *Crellius lib. de Deo & Attr. cap.* 24. *pag.* 201. 204. 212. This is an error against which we have as *many Arguments*, as there are *Prophecies* in the Old or New Testament, and had we no Prophecies, yet from reason it were easie to prove that God were not God, if he did not foreknow all futurities, *confiteri esse Deum, & negare præscium futurorum apertissima insania est*, saith St. *Augustine*, 'tis a manifest madness to acknowledge a God,

and to deny his Prescience; so manifest a madness, that the Remonstrants, who are wont to follow *Socinus* in many of his errors, do forsake him in this. *Episcopius* himself, though he profess that were it not for the irrefragable Authority of Divine predictions, he should incline to the opinion of them who deny prescience, adding that if Præscience of humane actions be not attributed to God, we may the more easily rid our selves of sundry difficulties, that occur concerning the Divine Providence: yet upon the account of Divine predictions, he is content to let God have his knowledge of things future, but it is but *tanti sper dum res clarius liqueat. Vid. Beveroviciium de termino vitæ pag.* 81. So as with *Episcopius* it is but a probationer attribute, and should be dismissed, if an answer could be found out for that Argument drawn from Divine Predictions, or Prophecies: in the mean time he hath most plainly determined, in the fourth Book of his *Institutions cap.* 18. That *it is not necessary to the attaining of eternal Salvation, that a man should either know or believe that the foreknowledge of future contingents doth agree to God.* I think that *Arminianism* doth take away the foundation of Gods Præscience, there being nothing but the Will and Decree of God, appointing and ordaining that a thing in its own nature contingent shall be, which can make it knowable, or certainly future; yet this Divine Decree the *Arminians* will at no hand acknowledge. I grant divers have taken pains to find out another bottom and foundation of Præscience, besides the Divine Will or Decree, but to very little purpose. Never could I in *Jesuit*, *Lutheran*, or *Arminian*, meet with any thing in this point that would satisfie a mind inquisitive after truth: some tell me of the *Ideas* in the Divine intellect, and say that by these God may know future contingents. *Ideas* upon the reasons and authorities alledged by the Schoolmen, I am willing to admit, but it is to me unimaginable, that an *Idea* should represent the futurity of that which in its own nature is meerly possible, and so indifferent either to be or not be, who ever found in his mind an *Idea*, representing whether his House were to be built: more I might say, were I not prevented by the Learned *Hoornebeck*, *Socin. confut. lib.* 2. *pag.* 343, 344. Others tell me of a real presence of things unto God from all eternity; which real presence if one should deny, I see not how it could be proved, if it should be granted I know not,

how

how on that Divine Præscience could be founded, for the proof of both these I refer to *Hornbeck, lib. 2. pag. 244, 245.* but I am most of all unsatisfied with the Jesuits *Scientia media*; well may I call it the Jesuits *Scientia media*, for *Molina* boasts that he was the first inventer of it; and doubtless unto him it doth own its Original, or else to *Fonseca*: the greatest antiquity it can pretend to, is less than *hundred years*; for *Fonseca* tells us, that in the year 1566. he propounded this, as the best way of *reconciling free will and grace*, but thought not meet to publish it till 1515. in which interval, namely about the year 1588. *Molina* published his Discourse, *de concordiâ liberi Arbitrii, & Gratiæ*, in which he hieth to this *Scientia media*, professing, *that it had not been to his knowledge delivered by any before.* If it had not been found out till 1660. I should not reject it upon that account, let's hear what it is, that by *which God before any act of his own will did know, which way the will of the Creature would turn it self, on supposition, that he afford such helps and concurses, and by which he would have known the contrary, had the will made use of its liberty to turn the other way.* Against such a *conditionate, middle* or *mixt knowledge*, ('tis called by all three names) our Reformed Divines, *English*, and *Transmarine* have brought such Arguments as never were answered, never can be answered. The truth is, this kind of knowledge is so unhappy an invention, that it brings in those very things, for the avoiding whereof, it was first devised; it was excogitated, *that the liberty of the will might not be taken away, and that God might not be made the Author of sin*, yet a Scholar of *Voetius*, hath undertaken to shew, and doth prove, that this conditionate knowledge *takes away all freedom from God and Men, necessarily brings in the* Stoical *fatality, and makes God the Author of sin*, see *Voet. Disp. Selec. Vol. 1. pag. 331, 332. &c.* I desire any man to try how he can answer Doctor *Twisse* his Argument, tending to prove that it is impossible to assign any other cause of a thing passing out of the rank of possible, into the rank of future, than the will of Gods Decree. There is a late nibler at this Learned Doctor, who had so much wit in his wrath, as not to attempt the answering of his Arguments, but yet (which is his way of disputing) rails against his proposition, that *Prescience of a thing future, must needs presuppose a*

These Papers were written about 1663.

Predestination, or a *predetermination of it*, as if it contained a senseless error [illegible] p. 128. the senselessness lies in this, because they who make use of this sentence, seem to think that God could decree to do something before he knew what he would decree to do, *If God did predetermine before he foreknew, he predetermined at a venture, he knew not what; God knew all things, which yet he cannot be conceived to have done, if any thing can be conceived before his knowledge*, pag. 129. There's in these Lines an Argument touched, but not of the Gentlemans own making, it had been before used by *Suarez*, and it is answered, satisfactorily answered, by that Scholar of *Vatius*; whom I before commended, *Selec. Disp.* pag. 394. We grant it would be blasphemously irrational, to say that God decrees he knows not what, but we deny that it will follow, that he knoweth not what, if he know not a thing as future, before he hath by his decree made it future. We deny not the received order betwixt the acts and objects of the understanding and will, but we say that the *Scientia* which *in signo rationis* preceeds, the decree is the *scientia simplicis intelligentiæ*, not the *Scientia visionis*.

This unhappy Disputant thought that because all Gods *præscience* is *science*, that therefore all his *science* is *prescience*; but he is now to take notice that there is a twofold knowledge,

1. Natural, by which God knows himself, and all things possible in his own essence, as a necessary cause of them; this knowledge in order of nature doth preceed any act of Gods will, it had agreed to him, though he had never made any decree at all concerning things *ad extra*, but this knowledge is at no hand to be called foreknowledge.

2. There is a knowledge which is called *Libera*, and this must necessarily suppose the act of the will, as the very name doth imply; unto this doth *præscience* belong. We say that God could not from all eternity have a certain free knowledge that a thing contingent should come to pass in time, if he had not decreed the thing to come to pass in time; but though God hath decreed all actions that are future, yet according to *Austins* distinction, *decrevit ut bona eveniant ipso faciente, mala ipso permittente*. This laid down, I shall consider one argument, by which Mr. P. goes about to prove that prescience preceeds the decrees of *election, reprobation and so dismisse him*, as a Writer fitter,

fitter for my pity then confutation, thus it is laid down 'Αυτοτα: *pag.* 129. *If Gods* præscience *precedent not his decrees of Election and reprobation, there was not a moment in which he was free to elect or reprobate, for the freedom to choose must needs preceed the act of choice, and to deny God his freedom in his Elections, is as impious as irrational.*" This is a ratiocination as loose, as ever I read, and yet it hath been my unhappiness to be constrained of late to read over the Pamphlets of men that made no pretence to Logick; Mr. P. might assure himself any Calvinist would deny his consequence, *if* præscience *precede not Gods decrees of Election and reprobation, there was there not a moment in Eternity, in which he was free to Elect or reprobate*; how hath he proved this consequence? why with this reason? *because freedom to choose, must needs precede the act of choice*, were this reason put into an *Enthymem* (the most proper argumentation to prove the consequence of a conditional proposition by) it would be ashamed of it self, though perhaps Mr. P. might not be ashamed of it; *freedom to choose must needs precede the Act of choice, Ergo, unless* præscience *precede Gods decrees of Election and reprobation, there was not a moment in Eternity, in which he was free to Elect or reprobate.* Baculus *stat in angulo, Ergo, cras pluit* may from henceforth be forgotten, and this *Enthymem* of Mr. P. be made use of, as the example of an absurd unconcluding argumentation, the best Apology I am able to frame for it, is that Mr. T. P. thought that Gods præscience did signifie Gods freedom to Elect, or reprobate.

Proceed we to the Heresie of Pelagius, *of that thus Doctor* Heylin, *Pag.* 7.

"*Pelagius*, a *Britain* born, either misguided by the lavishness of their (*i. e.* the Fathers who lived before *Austin*) expressions, or otherwise willing to get a name unto himself by by some new invention, ascribed so much unto the freedom of the will in acts of piety, *ut gratiam Dei necessariam non putaret*, as *Vincentius Strynensis* telleth us of him: This man associated with *Cælestinus* and *Julianus*, two of his Companions began to spread abroad their errors about the

"year 405. amongst the which those that especially concern "this purpose, are these two that follow,

"1. *Non esse liberum arbitrium, si Dei indiget auxilio, quo-* "*niam in propria voluntate habet, unusquisque facere aliquid* "*vel non facere.*

"2. *Victoriam nostram non ex Dei adjutorio esse, sed ex libero* "*arbitrio*, add unto these that *Orationes quas facit Ecclesia* "*pro infidelibus, & aliis peccatoribus, ut convertantur, sive pro fi-* "*delibus ut perseverent frustra fieri.*

"Pag. 8. These *Pelagian* Heresies did not hold out long, "being solemnly condemned in the two *African* Councels of "of *Cartage* and *Milevis*, confuted by St. *Augustin* with great "care and diligence: and finally retracted by *Pelagius* himself "in the Synod of *Palestine*.

"Pag. 9. After this time we meet with no such enemies, to "the grace of God, no such advancers of mans free will, and "the power of nature, as might entitle any man to the crime "of Pelagianism.

Answ. It must be acknowledged, that great care was used by the Church of God, to pluck up the tares that were sowed by *Pelagius*, and by (his Scholars shall I say or Masters) *Cælestius* and *Julianus*. The Learned and Holy Fathers employed their Pens against them, Councels made use of their authority against them, nor was the secular power wanting, to make very severe Edicts against them. But why doth the Doctor say that the *Pelagian* Heresies were retracted by *Pelagius* himself in the Synod of *Palestine*: Retractation is when a man out of conviction of judgement revokes his error, that *Pelagius* did in that Councel of *Palestine* do so, appears not. That Councel 'tis well known, is by *Hierom* called *a miserable Synod*, not as erring in Doctrine, but as erring in the person; supposing *Pelagius* to condemn his opinions heartily, which he condemned but feignedly, *Hier. Epis. 79.* He essayed also to put the same trick on the Church of *Rome*, but was not able, *Aug. de peccat. merit. & remiss. lib. 11. cap. 8. & 9.* And I doube there have been too many in these two last Centuries, that have too far imitated *Pelagius*, and seemed to have no enmity against grace (a word they frequently use) whereas upon examination it will be found that they were the enemies of it, and advancers of nature. To this end I must be more careful in setting

setting down the History of *Pelagius*, than the Doctor hath been. I must also touch upon the story of the *Semipelagians*, which he doth not so much as mention; and if after this it doth not appear that the Jesuits and *Arminians* deserve to be ranked with them, then let the Contra-Remonstrants be accounted as egregious Calumniators: as the Remonstrants are found to be, in laying the blasphemy of *Florinus*, to the charge of the *Calvinists*.

Pelagius is by the Learned *Vossius* more than once affirmed to be by birth a *Scotchman*, being such a Pestilent enemy to the grace of God (unto which we owe all that we have, and all that we are) it might be excusable, if we should let this error go undetected, but because truth is to be preferred to the honour of our Nation, we will rectifie that mistake, and acknowledge that he was our own Countryman, called (as is conceived) *Pelagius*, because born near the Sea-side; some *Cantabrigians* would have him a Student in their University, and so ungrateful to it, as to cause the overthrow and ruine of it, because it afforded Orthodoxe Divines that opposed his Doctrines; but upon the best search, it cannot be found that *Pelagius* in person did ever vent his poison in this Nation. They are in the right, who assign the Monastry of *Banchor* for the place of his education. As to his natural and acquired parts, it is not unknown how sleightly *Orosius* speaks of them in his Apologet: as if he had been a man *cui neque natales dederunt ut honestioribus studiis erudiretur, neque naturaliter proveniebat ut superet.* But though *Orosius* be not undeservedly by Mr. *Mountagne*, called *Nobilissimus rerum Christianarum Historicus*, yet is he not in this ingenuous, it being impossible that he should not have seen that Epistle of *Pelagius*, which sheweth him sufficiently a Schollar: had he not been so, the Fathers, and the Church of God, would never have so troubled themselves about him: his conversation is by some commended, by others who had as much reason to be acquainted with it, as much decryed, *vir egregie Christianus, vir Sanctus & non parvo profectu Christianus*, are Elogiums bestowed on him by *Austin*, a man who seems to be raised up on purpose to confute him, *lib. 3. de pec. merit. & remis. cap. 1. & 3.* it appears also by *Chrysostome* in his fourth *Epist. ad Olympiad.* that he was reckoned among the men that did live very temperately and fare hardly, insomuch that the Fa-

ther being at that time *in exile*, Death approaching, did grieve exceedingly, when he heard of his erring from the Faith; but yet I find *Pelusiota* (a Scholar of this very *Chrysostome* so Holy, that he was called by a peculiar name θεόστομος,) fastning a quite contrary Character on him, as if he were much under the power of a sensual appetite, and this in an Epistle directed to *Pelagius* himself, *Lib.* 1. *Epist.* 314. *pag. mihi* 84.

Πελαγίῳ μονάζοντι. Πῶς μοναχὸς πόθεν ἐν τόπῳ ἀμείβοντας τὸν Ἑρμῆν ἐξήνεγκεν πολιτεία, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνω τιμῶν τοῖς παιδίοις, καὶ οὐ πολὺς ὄχλος ἐπὶ πλείστῳ, ἀλλ' (εἰπὲ) ἀκμὴν ἔχεις τὸ φρόνημα, ἄλλην μὲν ἐξ ἄλλης ἀμείβων, καὶ πάσαν ἐρευνῶν τὰς τράπεζας εἰ ἂν κτίσεως μέλοι σοὶ καὶ ὅλον γαστρικείας, τοῖς ἐν τέλει μᾶλλον κολάζεις, καὶ τὰς πόλεις τοῖς γαστροδόλοις ἐρεύνᾳ ἐρημῶν· γὰρ ἀνθρώποις οὐ δεξιοῖς φιλοσοφεῖν οὐκ ἀρκεῖ.

How are these things to be reconciled? perhaps thus, *Pelagius* before he swerved from the Faith, did lead a strict life, and had a glorious form of Godliness, but when he fell into his horrid opinions derogatory to the grace of God, then was he a slave to his lusts, and just it was with God, to let him see how impossible it was to lead so much as a sober life without that grace, which he would not acknowledge necessary, no not to the highest acts of piety. Indeed *Jansenius* hath made this general observation, *that all the* Pelagians *were somewhat loose in their lifes*, which observation, as he takes abundance of good pains to prove, so can it not I conceive be too much considered in this Controversie; because the *Pelagians* do urge nothing more vehemently than this, that the *extolling of the Grace of God*, and lessening of the liberty of mans will is the readiest way to destroy all piety, as shall be seen more hereafter: mean while, we must take notice of a more modest and refined sort of *Pelagians*, commonly called *Semipelagians*, and from the place where they did most abound, *Massilienses*: Our *England* might accidentally occasion the rise of these men. *Agricola an Emissarie* of *Pelagius* had infected our Church with *Pelagianism*, which it was no difficult thing to do, considering the dreadful ignorance, and lazinesse of the *British* Bishops in those days; hereupon it was thought necessary to call in Forraign assistance; *Germanus* Bishop of *Auxerre*, and

Lupus

Lupus Bishop of *Troyes* are sent for out of *France*, who *not consulting with flesh and blood* came over, and by Preaching, and that signal dispute at St. *Albanes*, did so prevail, that the people who heard them, were generally either established or converted: but this *Root of bitternesse* not many years after began to sprout again, which occasioned an other voyage of *Germanus* into *Britain*, his companion being now not *Lupus* but *Severus*; success answered his second endeavours as his first, he so far prevailed, that the *Pelagians* dorst scarse shew their heads: yea a Synod was called, in the which their damnable opinions were condemned, all this may more fully be seen in Sir *Henry Spelman*, who follows venerable *Bede* and *Mat. westmon*: but whilest these good men are thus busied in a Neighbour Church, some Tares are Sowed in their own, yea and take deep Root, and spread very far these *Reliquiæ Pelagii* created St. *Austin* as much trouble, as the down right *Pelagians*. I know these *Semipelagians* did always profess to abhor *Pelagius*, and those Tenents of his, which the Church of God had condemned. *Vincentius Lirinensis*, one of them gives *Pelagius* the Epithet of *prophanus*, and his Scholar *Cælestius* of *prodigiosus*, but he that will take the pains to examine their opinions, shall find that they did, though not in every point, erre *Pelagius* his error.

Prosper in his 41. Chapter against *Cassian*, whom he calls by the name of *Collator*, lets fall these words, *Paria sunt unius seminis germina, & quod latebat in radicibus, manifestatur in fructibus. Non ergo cum istis novâ acie dimicandum est; nec quasi contra ignotos hostes specialia sunt ineunda certamina, tunc istorum machinæ fractæ sunt, tunc in superbiæ sociis & principibus corruerunt quando beatæ memoriæ* Innocentius *nefandi erroris capita Apostolico mucrone percussit.*

The question is, whether Arminius *and his followers do hold the opinions that the* Pelagians *and* Semipelagians *did*; Calvin *and his followers the same that* Austin, Prosper, Fulgentius *did? Affirmatur*, my affirmation I'le make good, by comparing the writings of each party, but shall first make use of one Argument, which alone will be sufficient to persuade my Reader that I am not mistaken, it is this, *That the* Pelagians *and* Semipelagians *did all along object the same things against, and lay the same imputations upon the* Augustinian *Doctrines, that now the* Arminians *do upon the* Calvinistical. What are the

the imputations and aspersions, which at this day are cast upon the *Calvinists*? are they not these,

1. *That they take away free will, and bring in a stoical fatality.*

2. *That they make God the Author of sin, and of all the punishments that do befal the Creature.*

3. *That they open a gap to despair and slothfulness.*

4. *That they take away all use of precepts, promises, threatnings, yea and prayer it self.*

5. *That they make God an impostor, seeing he commands men to repent, and believe, yet doth not seriously will their Faith and Repentance, nor their Salvation, unto which only Faith and Repentance can entitle them.*

6. *That their opinions are against the whole current and stream of antiquity.*

All these are urged by the Author, or rather the Authors of that Tract, called, *Gods Love to Mankind*, and indeed they do *utramque paginum facere* in all *Arminian* Writers. If all these horrid things were also laid to the charge of the blessed *Augustine*, it will at least be highly probable that *Austin* and *Calvin* were of the same mind about the Decrees of God, and those other Controversies depending thereupon, whether they were laid to his charge, the *taking away of free will, and introducing stoical fatality.* Six hundred times was it objected to the Father, especially by *Faustus* in his two Books, *de gratiâ & libero arbitrio, sub pietatis fronte gentilitatis fatum, & intir gratiæ Vocabulum absconditum erit fatale decretum, Faust. lib. 1. cap.* 4. *Pros.* in his Epistle to *Rust. Scriptæ ejus* (Augustini) *quibus error* Pelagianorum *impugnatur, infamant, dicentes eum liberum arbitrium penitus submovere, & sub gratiæ nomine necessitatem prædicare fatalem.*

2. Nor were they wanting to charge the Learned Bishop, with making God *the Author of sin, and of that damnation, which is a necessary consequent of mens dying in their sin*; Let any man but read over the *Vincentian Objections*, which the Learned *Vossius* thinks were made by *Vincentius Lirinensis*, he shall find that they harp upon no string more than this that *Austins* notion of the Divine Decree, ascribed the sin and damnation of men to God himself; the 4. to the 15. of those Objections, is nothing else, but this one charge prosecuted in different phrases and expressions.

3. Nor

3. Nor were they ashamed to say that his principles did *lead Sinners to desperation, and taught Saints to be slothful*, so much we learn from the Epistles of *Prosper* and *Hilary*, to St. *Austin*, in which the *Semipelagians* are brought in, saying that the Decree as conceived by St. *Austin* did, *et lapsis curam resurgendi adimere, & sanctis occasionem teporis afferre, eò quod & traque parte superfluus labor sit, si neque rejectus ullâ industriâ possit intrare, neque electus ullâ negligentiâ possit excidere: quoque enim modo se egerint, non posse aliud erga eos quam Deus definivit accidere, & sub incertâ spe cursum non posse esse constantem: cum si aliud habeat prædestinantis electio, cassa sit annitentis intentio.*

4. They wanted not a forehead to affirm, that *Austins* Doctrine took away all use of preaching, exhorting, reproving, praying, Hil. ad Aug. *excludi putant omnem prædicationis vigorem, si nihil quod per tam excitetur, remansisse dicatur*: Ibid. *si sic prædestinati sunt ad utramque partem, ut de aliis ad alios nullus possit accedere, quo pertinet tanta extrinsecus correptionis instantia?* To the same purpose *Prosper*; but let us hear our Countrey man *Faustus lib. 1. de grat. & lib. arb. cap. 4. qui unum ex origine perditum, alterum in prædestinatione affirmat electum, vide quo improbâ persuasione declinet, quid enim aliud dicit nisi adjutorio orationis venter indigeat, namijam præordinatis ad vitam necessaria non erit, deputatis ad mortem prodesse non poterit, in isto supervacuo, in illo infirma judicabitur. Beneficia supplicationis qui in acquisitiona prædestinationis est, non requirit: qui vero in perditionis parte, non recipit: quod si curam impendendam æstimat orationi, indubitanter intelligat ea quæ iminent posse mutari.*

5. They charged it upon *Austin*, that contrary to the plain words of the Apostle, he must needs hold *that God would not have all men to be saved, quod non omnes velit Deus Salvos fieri, sed certum numeram prædestinatorum*, are the words of the *Frenchmen*, or *Massilians*, (i. e. Semipelagians) *Cap. 8. Gall. quod Deus nolit omnes salvare, etiamsi omnes salvari velint*, is the second *Vincentian* Objection.

They said also that the blessed Fathers opinion was *destitute of all Antiquity*, and contrary to the opinion of all that had written before him; so *Prosper* in the very beginning of that Epistle, which he did write to *Austin*, *contrarium putant Patrum opinioni, & Ecclesiastico sensui quicquid de vocatione electorum*

ctorum secundum Dei propositum disputasti, and a little after, *obstinationem suam vetustate defendunt, & ea quæ de Epistolâ Apost.* Pauli Romanis *scribentis ad manifestationem Divinæ gratiæ præventientis electorum merita prosequuntur, a nullo unquam Ecclesiasticorum ita esse intellecta, ut nunc sentiuntur, affirmant.*

It can scarse be doubted, but that we who have the very same things objected against us, that were objected against St. *Austin*, are of the same mind that *Austin* was; but because I am resolved to give not only *full measure*, but also *running over*, I shall make a parallel betwixt the *Pelagian* and *Semipelagian* Heresie, and the opinions of *Arminius* and his Remonstrant crew.

Pelagius (in this not followed by the *Semipelagians*) did deny original sin, that in this he and *Arminians* do not differ needs not much proof; one of our own highly honoured by the men of his own party, in a Book called *unum Necessary*. doth in most express terms deny original sin, and take a great deal of unhappy pains to answer, or rather elude all the arguments, drawn either from Scripture, or experience for the proof of it; but perhaps *Arminius*, and his more *ancient Disciples* were modester? I must confess this Writer hath exceeded and gone beyond *Arminius*, and all the *Dutch* Remonstrants, but yet *Corvinus* hath told us cont. *Til. pag.* 388. *That with* Arminius *original sin, hath not the nature of sin or fault, properly so called.* I would feign have passed this as a Criticism, and charitably have supposed, that he had onely meant that original sin was not a sin or fault, in such a sense as actual sin is, but that I find *Arminius* himself answer to the ninth Question, Pag. 174. affirming that it is wrongfully said, *that original sin maketh a man guilty of death*; had he said that none are actually damned for original sin, it had been more tolerable, but to say that it doth not make guilty or obnoxious unto death, is to make it no sin at all; and yet thus do the Remonstrants also speak in *Apol. Cap* 7. *Peccatum originis nec habent pro peccato proprie sic dicto, quod posteros* Adami *odio Dei dignos faciat: nec pro malo, quod per modum proprie dictæ pœnæ ab* Adamo *in posteros dimanet*, &c. The *Pelagians* also were wont much to insist on this, that nothing could be both *a sin*, and a *punishment of sin*, because *sin* is *voluntary*, *punishment involuntary*, &c. *Austin* to convince them, used

used to produce that place, which indeed carrieth great evidence in it, *Rom.* 1. Against this *Julianus* would say those speeches were Hyperbolical; but yet the Father so pressed him, that sometimes he could not but acknowledge that something might be, *Et peccatum & pœna peccati*, when that, "*lib.* "5. *cont. Julia. cap.* 9. *Meministine quandiu disputaveris con-* "*tra lucidissimam quæ per Apostolum de prompta est veritatem,* "*affirmans nullo modo esse posse aliquid, quod & peccatum sit &* "*pœna peccati? quid est ergo nunc quod oblitus loquacitatis* "*tuæ?* Doth not *Arminius Pelagianize* in this, see but the one and thirtieth Article Objected to him, it will thence appear, that he took exception against the publick Catechism, because in it is said, that "original sin is a punishment, for if "God did punish *Adams* sin with this, then he must punish "this with another, and that other with another, and so "there will be a *processus in infinitum*. My business is not now to answer the Objections of *Arminius*, but only to discover his opinion, yet least any one should think this subtlety unanswerable, I refer him to the lately published Lectures of Doctor *Samuel Ward*, *de peccato Originali*, *p.* 8. where it is taken notice of, and answered satisfactorily.

Our next parralel shall be in the Doctrine, relating to *Gods Decret, and the absoluteness or conditionality thereof*. The opinion of *Pelagius* was, that *the well using of free will and natural powers is the cause of predestination*; how much or how little the *Massilians* differed from him, in assigning the cause of Predestination, is shewen largely by *Vossius*, *Hist. Pil. lib.* 6. *pag.* 533, 534, &c. and by *Jansenius de Hæres. Pelag. lib.* 8. *cap.* 21. To whom I refer my Reader, and shall now onely take notice of Saint *Prospers* Epistle to Saint *Austin*, in which I find the *Semipelagians* thus represented, "They hold that "God before the Foundations of the World were laid, did "foresee who would believe, and who would persevere in "that Faith, (to this perseverance in faith they acknow-"ledged the help of grace was needful) and predestinated "these to his Kingdom, of whom he foresaw that they would "be worthy his vocation, and go out of this World making "a good end. If their judgement was asked about infants dying in their infancy, they would reply that they were predestinated to life or death, according to the good or bad life which

which God foresaw they would have lead, if they had come to maturity of years.

Do the *Arminians*, who are so angry when called *Pelagians*, differ from them in this? I confess *Arminius* doth not make a man to be predestinated from *foreseen works*, but from *foreseen Faith*; nor doth he make Faith the *cause*, but a *condition*, or *decent antecedent*, using a less suspected term, but intending the very same thing; for as our incomparable *Davenant* hath well observed, "Conditions are "of two sorts, common, and distinguishing; these "later, he defineth to be such acts or qualities, "which being foreseen, or preconsidered in the "subject contrary Divine Acts; are exercised about that subject. *Arminius* when he makes Faith a condition of Divine Election, infidelity a condition of reprobation, takes the word condition in the later sense, and so plainly makes it the same with a meritorious or motive cause, for he every where maintains that, *posita fide ponitur electio, negata fide negatur electio*: That Faith is a means ordained and appointed by God for the obtaining of Election; therefore as that Learned Professor well concludes, *Pag.* 119, 120. *Sunt meræ verborum præstigiæ, cum aiunt prævisam fidem & infidelitatem esse conditiones, non modo quæ præcedunt prædestinationem & reprobationem communiter & promiscue consideratam, sed etiam ex quibus oritur distinctio electorum, & tamen negant habere aliquam causalitatem.*

Dissert. de præ & reprob. p. 118.

Consequently, as the *Pelagians* and *Semipelagians* did hold that the number *of Elect and reprobate was not definite, but undefinite and indeterminate*; So also do the *Anticalvinists* or *Arminians*, *Illud pariter non accipiunt eligendorum rejiciendorumque esse definitum numerum*, saith *Hilary Epist. ad August.* of the *Massilians*, *Grevincov. Thes. exhib. p.* 137. saith the same, *Electio incompleta potest interrumpi, ac interdum interrumpitur: suntque incomplete electi vere quidem electi; sed possunt fieri reprobi, ac perire: numerusque electorum potest augeri ac minui.*

3. Our third parallel shall be in the Doctrine of grace, and efficaciousness of grace. *Hilary* in the so often quoted Epistle to *Austin*, thus describes the *Massilians*, *they affirm the will to be so free, that it can of its own accord admit or refuse Cure or Medicine*: and *Faustus* plainly tells us, *that though it be of the grace*

grace of God that men are called, yet the following the call is referred to their own will. Are our *Arminians* any whit more careful to give *grace* the things that *belong to graces?* do they not make converting grace to be nothing else but a *gentle persuasion?* do they not every where rant against those who hold that God doth by an Omnipotent and unresistable motion beget Faith, and other Divine Graces in us? I shall among many places that do occur, for the confirmation of this make choice onely of two: *Hague conference pag.* 282. *A man may hinder his own regeneration, even then when God will regenerate him, and doth will to regenerate him; And Arnold against Bogerm. Pag.* 263. saith expressly, *that all the operation which God useth to the Conversion of men being already performed, yet this Conversion still remaineth in mans power, so that he can convert or not convert, believe or not believe.*

I had thought to have proceeded to the perseverance, but that I considered the necessary dependance of that on the other two, concerning Election and Grace; by what hath already been laid down it is manifest, that if the *Pelagians* and *Semipelagians* were in the right, then are not the *Arminians* mistaken; but if *Austin*, *Prosper*, *Hilary*, and those others whom the Church of God hath been wont to grace with the Title of *Orthodox*, were not in an error, then Mr. *Calvin* and those that follow him are in the right.

Object. Here I may expect it will be said, that the Doctrine most quarrelled at in the *Calvinists*, is the *Doctrine of absolute reprobation*, and in favour of that nothing hath yet been produced out of Orthodox antiquity.

Answ. To that I shall answer,

1. By concession that if by reprobation absolute, be meant *a purpose to damn any man without consideration of, or respect unto sin, either actual or original*; such an absolute reprobation is indeed unknown to all antiquity; but as yet I could never meet with that *Calvinist* that asserted such an absolute reprobation.

2. But if by reprobation absolute be meant, *Gods purpose to deny Grace to some*, according to the pleasure of his will, I then stick not to affirm, that such reprobation absolute, is not unknown to antiquity. Indeed the Ancients do rarely speak of reprobation; our Church in her Articles mentions it not at all,

all, both they and the leave us to gather the nature of reprobation, which is but *Non-Election* or *Preterition*, from what we find laid down concerning *Election*. Now seeing the Fathers, those of them that had to do with the *Pelagians* and *Semipelagians* did constantly affirm, *that Gods own good will, not any foresight of the good use of free will was it, which moved God to give converting grace unto some*; They must also hold that God did out of his own good pleasure, and not from any fore sight of an ill use of free will, purpose to deny this efficacious converting grace unto other; indeed it's scarce rational to assert, that God should purpose not to cure any one, because he is sick, not to enlighten any one, because he was by him looked on as dark and blind. But concerning the Judgement of Antiquity in this matter, no more shall be said at present, the Reader, that desire further satisfaction, is referred to the Learned *Davenant*, in the close of his most accurate dissertation, concerning Election and Reprobation. As for *Vossius* his judgement concerning reprobation, it is considered in a Manuscript by Dr. *Twisse*, which Manuscript may possibly in a short time be published, from it, the World will soon see how unjustly the absolute Decree is charged with Novelty.

Obj. 2. It may be further objected, that about the year 415. there were a Sect of men called *Prædestinati*, who were accounted and condemned for Hereticks, whose opinions about the Divine Decrees seem to be the very same that are now maintained by the followers of *Calvin*.

Answ. This Objection were scarce worth the taking notice of, if one *R. B.* Gentleman, in his *English Manual*, called a *Muster rool of evil Angels*, had not placed the *Prædestinati* among the Capital Hereticks, but since it hath pleased him so to do, upon the credit and authority of *Sigebert* Monk of *Gemblaux*, it will be needful to let the *English* Reader know, that this Predestinarian Heresie is a meer figment, and that there never were any such Hereticks as the *Prædestinati*, so much this Mr. *R. B.* might have learned from Dr. *Twisse* answer to *Gods Love to Mankind*, Part 1. *pag.* 58, 59. and more fully from *Jansenius*, *Tom.* 1. *pag.* 219, 220. *&c.* had there been any such Heresie Anno 415. or 414. undoubtedly St. *Austin* and St. *Prosper* would have taken notice of it, and have endeavoured to

See more marginal Confutation of that figment

o distinguish their own opinion from it, which yet no nan saith they do; On the contrary, it is manifest that he *Dogmata* which are by *Sigebertus*, *Hincmarus*, and *Gennadius* fathered upon the Prædestinarians, are the very Tenents, with which the *Semi-Pelagians* did asperse St. *Austin* and his followers.

From St. *Austin* Dr. *Heylin* takes a leap to the Councel of *Trent*, but I shall not so do; the transactions concerning *Godescalk* the Monk must stay us a while, because they are somewhat differently related by learned Men. *Godescalk* is by *Vossius* from *Hincmar*, described to be one of *a fierce mind, impatient of rest, a lover of Novelty*, with *Rabanus Marus* also he goes for no better than a *Sciolist*, but these characters are the less to be regarded, because drawn by the hands of two professed Enemies, and because *Walafridus Strabo*, a *Disciple* of this *Rabanus Maurus*, and as *Flacc. Illi.* saith, his *Notary*, gives us a very high and large commendation of *Gotes.* both as to Life and Learning, which commendation is to be seen in Bishop *Ushers* History, *Gotes. pag.* 38, 39. this *Gotes.* was one that had much read the *Fathers*, especially St. *Austin*, with whom he did perfectly agree as to the Doctrine of Prædestination, as may be seen in his Confessions, first published by the incomparable *Usher*; but some not regarding so much what his opinion truly was, as what were the consequences which they thought did flow from it, charge him with blasphemy, as the *Massilians* of old did saint *Austin*. *Rabanus Maurus* by the command of *Lewis* King of *Germany*, called a Synod of Bishops and Abbots at *Moguntia*, in which *Godescalk* it condemned, but condemned for that which he seems not to be guilty of, as if he had held and maintained *that good men were inevitably pre-ordained to a life of happiness, wicked men inevitably pre-ordained to a life of endless misery, and that it profiteth not the wicked if they be converted, nor hurteth the Godly if they sin.* In this Synod *Trithemius* tells us, that he recalled and revoked his error, but if he had so done, then would not both *Rabanus* and *Hincmarus* charge him, which yet full oft they do, with obstinacy: however at this Synod, *Godescalk* was banished *Germany*, and made to promise not to return, and sent to his own Bishop, *i. e.* the Arch-bishop of *Rhemes*,

Epist. ad Nicol. Papum.

for unto his Jurisdiction did the Monastery of *Orbex* (out of which *Godescalk* came) belong. The Epistle of *Rabanus* to *Hincmarus* signifying this, is to be seen in *Historiâ Godes. pag.* 46. One would think at this Synod *Godescalk* met with hard measure, but harder was measured out to him in the Synod held in the Palace of *Carisacum*: for being heard a second time, it is decreed that he should be devested of his *Sacerdotal Office*, if *ever he were truly a Priest*, (which those Fathers seem not willing to acknowledge, because forsooth he was ordained by *Rigbold*, *Suffragan* of *Rhemes*, the Bishop of *Suesson* not consulted) *Yea, that he should be whipped notwithstanding his Age, and confined for ever to his Cell.* But what was all this while become of the *Augustinian* spirit? was all the World so soon become *Pelagian*? in no wise: *Remigius* as much appeared for the justification of *Godescalk*, as did either *Rabanus* or *Hincmarus* for his condemnation. The Church of *Lyons* stoutly censureth and confuteth the decrees of this *Carisiacan* Synod; and whereas one *Johannes Scotus Erigena*, a good Philosopher, but no great Divine, had written a Book against the cause of *Godescalk*, consisting of 19. Chapters, one *Florus* a Deacon of the Church of *Lyons* answered him. In the year 855. a Councel was held at *Valens*, wherein Canons were made diametrically opposite to the determinations of the *Carisiacan* meeting; and to the propositions of *Scotus Erigena*. Learned *Baronius* mistaking the Phrase *Scotorum pultes*, thinks that this *Valentinian* Synod was called against some wandring *Scotchmen*, of which *Godescalk* was chief, and that the opinion of *Godescalk* was there again condemned: whereas we there find *Scotus* his *capitula* condemned, as containing *Diaboli commentum*, rather than *argumentum aliquod fidei*. Of the four *capitula* of *Hincmarus*, indeed the Synod speaks somewhat more mildly and favourably, but yet so as to ascribe to them *inutilitatem, vel etiam noxietatem, & errorem contrarium veritati*; When these *Valentian* Fathers come to speak of grace and free will, these are their words: *Item de gratia per quam salvantur credentes, & sine quâ rationalis creatura nunquam beate vixit & de libero arbitrio per peccatum in primo homine infirmato, sed per gratiam Domini Jesu in fidelibus ejus redintegrato & sanato, id ipsum constantissime*

tissime & fide plenâ fatemur, quod Sanctissimi Patres auctoritatem sacrarum literarum nobis tenendam reliquerunt, quod Africana, *quod* Arausica *Synodus professa est*; In this Synod were present the Bishops of three Provinces in number fourteen, though as the Preface plainly intimates, *Ebbo* Bishop of *Gratianopolis* had the chief hand in compiling the Canons. Nor had the great Volume which *Hincmar* made against these Canons any great effect, for in the year 859. a Councel being called at *Lingon*, the Canons of the *Valentine* Synod are again confirmed and ordered to be promulged for the instruction of the Lords People, those words onely being left, wherein express mention was made of *Hincmars* four *capitula*, being to avoid offence, left out.

But it is objected in *Gods Love to Mankind*, that in this very *Valentine* Synod it is affirmed, *that the wicked do therefore perish, not because they could not, but because they would not be good, and by their own fault original or actual, also remained in the masse of perdition*; Yea, the Fathers of that Councel denounce *Anathemas to those that held, that men are so predestinated to evil, as that they cannot be otherwise; that any should be predestinated to evil by the power of God so as he cannot be otherwise, we do not only not believe, but also if there be any that will believe so great an evil, we with all detestation denounce them accursed, as the* Arausican *Councel also doth.* And at the Councel of *Arles* assembled against the *Pelagians*, these Anathemas were denounced, *Cursed be the man that shall say that the Man that perished might not have been saved*, and again, *Cursed be the man that shall say that a Vessel of dishonour may not rise to be a Vessel of honour.* For answer, it were easie to reject those Anathemas of the Councel of *Arles* as spurious, and forged by *Faustus* that Arch-Semi-pelagian, but we need not trouble our selves so to do, for there is nothing in any or all these passages that may not stand with absolute reprobation, for absolute negative reprobation, preterition, or non-election, may well consist with a possibility of avoiding sin and damnation, as all, both *Super* and *Sublapsarians* grant in the Non-elect Angels; and in the *protoplast*, in whom they are wont to say, that all and every person received the *posse stare*, and a *posse salvari*. A man that of impenitent becomes penitent, may be said

to rise from being a Vessel of dishonour, to be a Vessel of honour; but never did any of non-elect become elect, never did any who was under a non-predestination unto effectual and infallible means of eternal life, procure to be under a predestination unto effectual and infallible means of eternal life.

"In such condition, saith the Doctor, stood affairs in reference to the Doctrines of Predestination, Grace, Free Will, at the first sitting down of the Councel of *Trent*, in which those points became the subject of many sad and serious debates amongst the Prelats and Divines then there Assembed; which being so necessary to the understanding of the questions, which we have before us: I shall not think my time ill spent in laying down the sum and abstract of the same, as I find it digested to my hand, by *Padre Paul Cap.* 2. *p.* 12.

I shall first shew that it need not much trouble a Christian mind what was determined at *Trent*.

2. I shall shew that nothing was determined at *Trent*, but what is consistent enough with the *Calvinian* Doctrine, as touching Predestination, Free Will, Perseverance,

1. I say 'tis not greatly material what was determined at that meeting of *Trent*, for notwithstanding it is by Papists honoured with the name of a General, and Oecumenical Councel, yet all Protestants see that it was a Conventicle of a few men, wedded to the Popes wicked interest, and resolved to make such determinations, not as were agreeable to the truth, but as were consistent with the pomp and glory of the *Roman* See; to evince this, I had thought to present my Reader with a short History of this Councel, gathered out of *Padre Paul* the *Servite*, and *Sleidan*, but the Reverend and Learned Doctor *John Cosins* hath happily saved me this labour, and done the work to my hand, his Collection I shall transcribe:

The calling of a Councel had been shifted of by *Leo* the X. *Adrian* the VI. *Clement* the VII. but *Paul* the III. famous for nothing more then dissimulation, condescended so far, that a Synod should be summoned at *Mantua* in *Italy*, and sent his Bull of Indiction *May* 27. *Anno* 1531. but his design not taking for that place, he sent out another Bull for

for a Councel to be held *May* the first 1538. at *Vicenza*, a City under the Dominon of the *Venetians*. This Indiction meeting also with opposition, he sends forth a third Bull, which commanded all Bishops & Abbots with other privilegded persons, provided they had taken an Oath to be obedient to the Pope's See of *Rome*, to repair to *Trent*, on the Confines of *Italy*, there to attend the Legates for the celebration of a Councel, to be begun *November* the first, *Anno* 1542. against this Councel, protestations were made by the Princes, and all the Reformed Churches in *Germany*, as also by the Kingdoms of *England* and *Denmark*, and many other places besides, which brought it to nothing; wherefore he set forth another Bull, and sent his Legates to *Trent*, to begin a Councel there, *March* 15. *Anno* 1545. The Legates being come to *Trent*, found no Prelate there, but the Bishop of the place. Within a few days came three *Italian* Bishops, who being dependants upon the Court of *Rome*, and Men very ready to promote the Popes service, had order from him to be there with the first; for his desire was that the Councel should begin with as few as might be, and that to regulate the rest that came after. In order whereunto he sent his Brief, and gave his Legates a Faculty, to preside in the Councel under his Name and Authority; with special directions, not to suffer any thing to be proposed or offered there to publick debate, which had not first been privately approved by themselves, or any thing to be put to the question and defined, which had not been formerly sent to *Rome*, and assented to by him; and with power if need were to do him service in it, either to break up the Councel for altogether, or to suspend and prorogue it from time to time, or to remove and translate it from one place to another, at their pleasure; which was a device whereby all attempts and motions that might be made against the enormities of the *Roman* Court, should be sure to be defeated. For above all other things this was the principal matter, which was given them in charge, that they should not in any case suffer the Authority and Power of the Pope to be questioned. There was a proviso in the first words of the Bull, that they should do nothing without the consent of the Councel, but afterwards that clause was

thought need to be altered, and the Legats had an absolute power given them independent of any but the Pope himself, whose service they only attended.

Two Months passed after their coming to *Trent*, before they got twenty Prelates into their company, and because they were somewhat ashamed to begin their Oecumenical Councel (as they are not ashamed to call it) with so small a number, they perswaded the Pope to put it off for eight months longer; though much a do they had to perswade the Prelates to stay all that while with them. But by the Months of *December* and *January* following, (having in the mean while contented the poorer sort of Bishops with a pension of fourty Ducats a piece, procured for them out of the Popes coffers,) they grew to somewhat a greater number. For besides the Legates, and the Cardinal Bishop of *Trent*, there were present four Arch-bishops, eight and twenty Bishops, three Abbots, and four Generals. And these three and fourty persons made the general Councel. Among whom two of the Arch-bishops were only Titular, being the Popes Pensioners at *Rome*, and now sent to *Trent* to increase the number, and to depend upon the Legats; but in those Churches whereof they bare the names, had they nothing to do, nor were they any lawfull and true Bishops at all. The one of these was *Olaus Magnus* the *Goth*, who went for the Arch-bishop of *Upsale* in *Swedlande*, and the other blind Sir *Robert* the *Scot*, who appeared for the Primat of *Armagh*, in *Ireland*, and of whom it was then commonly said, that as pore-blind as he was, yet had he the commendation to ride Post the best in the World. And with these men they began their Oecumenical Chapter at *Trent*. Thus far the Learned Doctor, whose design was only to take notice of an *Anathema*, passed in the fourth Session of this Conventicle, by which all were cursed that did not receive the new Canon of Scripture, in such manner and form as was there first appointed, but that design lead him afterwards to observe that in this *Trent* Assembly, there were private Congregations, which were appointed to be kept twice a week at one of the Legats Houses, for the proposing, debating, and framing of all their Decrees, before they were brought to be voted and defined abroad in any publick Session; for

by

by this means the Legats would be sure, either to have every thing prepared to their own mind, and be able to number the Voices before hand, which way they would be given, or else not to suffer the matter to be brought to any open definition in their Council at all. Finally, the foresaid Learned Doctor having given us the Decree concerning the new Canon, saith that it was passed but by a few; for of the *Greek* Church they had not one, unless it were some such as blind Sir *Robert* of *Scotland* was. Of the *English* as few, (for the Bishop of *Worcester*, *Richard Pates* was not yet come among them, and when afterwards he came thither, he was there but in a private and personal capacity, having no employment given him by the Church of *England*) of the *Helvetian*, *German*, and *Northern* Churches none; of the *French* Church scarce two; of the *Spanish* not many, all the rest were *Italians*, among whom divers were the Popes Pensioners, and sent thither to out ballance other mens voices, some of them Titular, and some Unlearned.

He that pleaseth may read the stary of the remaining 21. Sessions in *Padre Paul*, and having so done, let him if he be impartial, judge whether it be probable, that such a company of men should be blessed by God, to find out truth, and settle the peace of the Church; but let us suppose there had been at *Trent* a Meeting of the most Holy, Reverend, and Learned Divines, that the Church of Christ then afforded, did they determine any thing either for, or against the *Calvinians* in these five points? in no wise; debates indeed there were about the misterious point of Prædestination, in which those Popish Divines which went the way that *Pelagius* did of old, and *Arminius* of late, prevailed, whilest use was made only of corrupt carnal humane reason; but when the testimonies of Scripture came to be examined, they were manifestly overcome, as Doctor *Heylin* himself tells us out of the incomparable *Servits Hist. Pag.* 15. the same Doctor confesseth *that the Decrees about this, and the points connexed with it, were so contrived, that every one might understand them in his own sense, so as to give no distast to the Dominican Fryars, and their adherents, pag.* 26. Indeed the ancienter Popes of *Rome*, (notwithstanding the great pretence they

they make to infallibility,) were wiser then to take upon them, to determine the differences betwixt the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*, which are almost the same with the differences betwixt the Contra-Remonstrant and Remonstrant, *Micrælius* in his *Hetorodoxia Calvinian disputatione quinta*, shall be my witness for this; who after that had told the World how much this question had vexed the *Pontifician* Schools, *how God was not the cause of sin, seeing he was the cause of those actions, as to their substance unto which moral pravity is conjoyned*; thus expresseth himself, *Lib. 6. Hæc cum ita disceptabantur, factum est tandem* Lovanij *in* Belgio *ut circa* 86. *annum superioris sæculi gravissimæ de Prædestinatione inter Dominicanos & Jesuitas lites extiterint, quas quidem Nuntius Apostolicus ad tempus composuit, sed postquam Jesuita* Lud. Moiina *librum de concordia liberi arbitrii, & donorum gratiæ evulgarat, res ad ipsum pontificem delata est: qui tamen arbitrum se veritus est interponere, & suam cuique permisit sententiam:* At which I do the less wonder, because I find that the Pope had used the same artifice in a controversie depending betwixt the *Franciscans* and *Dominicans*, about the Virgin *Maries* being or not being conceived free from Original sin: alledging the Spirit (of whose perpetual assistence Popes are wont so proudly to boast) *nondum mysterij tanti penetralia Ecclesiæ suæ patefecisse*, a brief, but accurate story of this transaction is to be seen in the learned Apology of Dr. *Andrew Rivet*, for the most Holy Virgin, *lib.* 1.*cap.*6, 7, 8. Yea, something may be observed in the Councel of *Trent*, which makes not a little for the Calvinists, *viz.* that not *Calaurnius* (as the Doctor pag. 15.) but *Catharnius* invented a middle way, "That God of his goodness had "elected some few whom he will save absolutely, "to whom he hath prepared most potent, effectual, "and infallible means, and that of these thus singu-"larly priviledged all the places of Scripture, which "do ascribe all to God, and which shew infallibility, are "to be understood, and that the number of these is cer-"tain with God; yea, *Balthasar Meisues* in his *Anthropolo-"gia Sacra, de gratia Dei et Prædestinatione disp.*11. Yields in "in the examples of *Paul* and *Abram* a grace extraordi-"nary, efficacious, infallibly, and always, which so calls a man

"man that as it were by a necessary will, and willing ne-
"cessity, he is converted unto Faith and the Church, of
"which no cause can be assigned, but the will of God,
"the simple and absolute will of God, which cannot be hin-
"dred, is always most efficacious. From these two mens acknowledgements and confessions, I infer, that seeing some are absolutely elected and converted by an insuperable grace, that therefore absolute election and grace insuperable are not contrary to Divine Wisdom, or Goodness, or Justice, do not destroy the Liberty of mans Will, and therefore are but weakly impuged, when they are impugned by arguments drawn from these *Topikes*. But if that will do the Doctor any courtesie, or if he think it any credit to his cause, I will grant him that that part of the Papacy, which is most Papal, doth favour his *Arminianism*: and not many years ago, a Pope as wicked as ever sate in the Chair, when he was come to his dotage, was prevailed with, to make use of his infallibility, and to condemn the Doctrine of *Jansenius*. A copy of his Anathemaes and condemnations, I have thought meet to insert, as I find them in *Maresius* the Professor of *Groning* his Apology for the *Jansenists*.

"*Innocent*, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, to
"all faithful people in Christ, Health, and Apostolical be-
"nediction.

"Whereas upon occasion of publishing a Book Enti-
"tuled, *Augustinus Cornelii Jansenij Episcopi Iprensis*, a-
"mongst other opinions of his, there did arise (especially
"in *France*) a controversie upon five of them, many of the
"Bishops of *France*, did sollicite us to consider those propo-
"sitions presented to us, and to give our certain and defi-
"nite sentences touching every one of them.

The

The Tenour of the said Propopositions is as followeth.

THe first, Some precepts of God are impossible to just men, willing and endeavouring according to the present power which they have, Grace also is wanting to them, whereby they might be possible.

The second, In the state of lapsed nature, there is no resistance made to interiour grace.

The third, To merit and demerit in the state of lapsed nature, there is not required in man liberty from necessity, but liberty from co-action is sufficient.

The fourth, The Semi-Pelagians did admit the necessity of interiour preventing grace to every Act, even to the beginning of Faith; and in this they were Hereticks, because they would have that grace to be such as the will of man might resist or obey.

The fifth, It is Semi-Pelagianisme to say; that Christ died, or shed his blood for all men without exception.

We, to whom among the manifold cares which dayly molest our mind, it lies chiefly upon our heart, that the Church of God committed unto us from above (the errours of wicked opinions being purged) may safely pass the warfare, and as it were a Ship in a calm Sea, the Waves and storms of all tempests being allayed, may safely sail and arrive unto the wished, for Haven of salvation.

For

For the weightiness of these five Propositions tendred to us, as aforesaid we have caused every of them to be diligently examined by divers Doctors in Divinity, before certain Cardinals of the Holy Roman *Church, and have maturely considered their suffrages, delivered both by voice and writing, and have heard the same Doctors in several Congregations held before us largely discoursing upon them, and every of them. Whereas from the beginning of this discussion, we enjoyned both publickly and privately the prayers of many faithful Christians, to be made for the obtaining of the Divine assistance, afterwards the same being more fervently renewed, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit by us carefully implored, at last by the Divine Majesty of God assisting, we proceeded to this underwritten declaration and determination.*

The first, of the aforesaid Propositions (some precepts of God are impossible to just men, willing and endeavouring according to the present power they have, they wanting grace by which they might be possible) we declare to be temerarious, impious, blasphemous, condemned under Anathema, and Heretical, and we declare it to be such.

The second, (That in the state of lapsed nature, there is no resistance made to interiour grace,) we declare to be Heretical, and as such we condemn it.

The third, (That to merit & demerit in the state of lapsed nature there is not required in man liberty from necessity but liberty from co-action is sufficient,) we declare to be Heretical, and we condemn it as such.

The fourth, (That the Semi-Pelagians did admit the

the necessity of interiour preventing grace to every Act, even to the beginning of Faith; and in this they were Hereticks, because they would have that grace to be such as the will of man might resist or obey) we declare false and Heretical, and as such we condemn it.

The fifth, (That it is Semi-Pelagianism, to say, that Christ died, or shed his blood for all men without exception,) we declare false, temerarious, scandalous, and (being understood in that sense, that Christ should have died onely for the salvation of the Predestinated) impious, blasphemous, contumelious, derogatory to Divine goodness and Heretical, and as such we condemn it.

We therefore command all faithful people in Christ of either Sex, that they do not presume to think, teach or preach otherwise of the said propositions then is contained in this our present Declaration, and Determination, under the censures and penalties against Hereticks and their Favourers, expressed in Law. We likewise command all Patriarchs, Arch-bishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries of Places, Inquisitors of Heretical prævities, that they repress and restrain all the Contradictors and Rebels whatsoever, by the censures and penalties aforesaid, and all other opportune remedies by Law, fact, and usage, the help also of secular power being called in hereunto if need be. We do not intend nevertheless by this Declaration and Definition made upon the five Propositions aforesaid, any way to approve, other opinions which are contained in the

the aforesaid Book of Cornelius Jansenius. *Given at* Rome *at* St. Mary Major, *in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord* 1653. Kal. Jun. *the ninth year of our Pontificat.*

Hi. Datarius.

G. Gualterius.

P. Ciampinus.

In the year of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ 1653. *the sixth indiction, the ninth year of the Pontificat of our most Holy Father in Christ, and our Lord,* Innocent, *by the Divine Providence Pope* X. *the ninth day of the Month of* June, *the aforesaid constitution was affixed and published,* in Eccles. Lateranens. ac Basilicæ principis Apostolorum de urbe, necnon Cancellariæ Apostolicæ valvis ac in acie campi Floræ, per me *Hieronymum Masellam*, Sanctissimi *D. N.* Papæ cursorem.

Pro D. Mag. *Cursorum.*

P. Paulus *Desiderius Cursor.*

A good part of this condemnation of *Jansenius* is mentioned by *Arnoldus Poelenbergius*, in an Epistle to *Christianus Hartsoeckerus*, *Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ*, *pag.* 845. in which he pretends (good man) to be grieved that the *Pontificians* who do too often deviate from Scripture, when they attribute too much to Traditions, should sometimes be more wise in Divine things than our Reformed Divines, who yet acknowledge Scripture alone to be the *norma* and *regula* of our faith, and that the poor *Jansenists* might have no starting hole, by slipping into which to avoid the force of this condemnation, the Jesuit did put a new Article into his Creed the 12*th.* of *December* 1661. *Datur in Ecclesiâ Romanâ controversiarum fidei Iudex infallibilis extra Concilium Generale, tam in quæstionibus juris quam facti. unde post* Innocentij X. Alex. VII. *constitutiones fide Divinâ credi potest librum cui titulus est* Augustinus Jansenii *esse Hæreticum*, *& quinquæ propositiones ex eo decerptas esse* Jansenii, *& in sensu* Jansenij *damnatas.*

WAL-

HISTORIA
Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata;
OR
ANIMADVERSIONS
ON
Dr. Heylin's
QUINQUARTICULAR
HISTORY.

WHether the Doctor hath so many and so firm Friends among the Protestants must now be tried; but we shall not presently fall upon the *Augustan Confession*; it would be injurious to the *Evangelical Churches* in the Valleys of *Piedmont* if we should take no notice of their Confessions: Churches of which, Doctor *Heylin* was pleased in a former Edition of his *Geography* to say, *That they did never bow the knee to Baal*: of which the Friar *Raynerius Saccus*, writing against them *Anno* 1254., confesseth, that they continued from the times of the Apostles. In Mr. *Morland's* History of these Churches, I find, page 39, 40. *A brief Confession of Faith made with general consent by the Ministers and Heads of Families of the Churches of the Valleys of* Piedmont, *assembled in* Angrogne *Sept.*

Sept. 12. *Anno* 1532. but said to contain that Doctrine which was delivered to them by Tradition from their Fore-fathers. In that Confession these are three Articles:

"1. All those that have been and shall be saved, have been "elected of God before the foundation of the world.

"2. It is impossible that those that are appointed to salva-"tion, should not be saved.

"3. Whosoever upholdeth Free-will, denieth absolutely "Predestination, and the Grace of God."

I find also *page* 61, *&c.* another Confession of the said Churches, which was published but in the year 1655. consisting of thirty three Articles, whereof the eleventh is this:

"God saveth from Corruption and Condemnation those "whom he hath chosen from the foundation of the World, "not for any Disposition, Faith, or Holiness that he saw in "them, but of his meer Mercy in Jesus Christ his Son, passing "by all the rest, according to the irreprehensible reason of "his Free-will and Justice. The twenty sixth is as followeth:

"The Church cannot err, nor be annihilated, but must en-"dure for ever; and all the Elect are upheld and preserved "by the power of God in such sort, that they all persevere in "Faith unto the end, and remain united in the holy Church "as so many living members thereof.

In the close of this they protest, *That they do agree in sound Doctrine with all the Reformed Churches of* France, Great Brittain, *the Low*-Countries, Germany, Switzerland, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, *and others*, (as it is represented by them in their Confessions) *as also we receive the Confession of* Augsburg: Therefore certainly they did not apprehend that their opinions about Predestination, Grace, Perseverance, had any thing in them contrary to either the Articles of the Church of *England*, or to the *Augustan* Confession; both which, it seems, are by Doctor *Heylin* thought to be *Anti-Calvinistical*; but without any reason, as shall (God willing) be made to appear.

Chap. 4. page 30, 31. Doctor *Heylin* tells us, *That we need not take much pains in looking after the judgment of the* Lutheran *Churches, which come so near to that of the Church of* Rome, *as to be reckoned for the same.* That he may not seem to be mistaken in making them the same, he doth, *page* 32, 33. extract out of the *Augustan* Confession the Doctrine of the

Lutheran

Lutheran Churches in the five points; only adding one clause to the first Article out of the writings of *Melanchthon*, and other learned men of that persuasion. Well, what is this addition? "God beholding all Man-kind in their wretched "condition, was pleased to make a general conditional Decree of Predestination, under the condition of Faith and "Perseverance; and a special absolute Decree of Electing "those to Life whom he foresaw would Believe and Persevere "under the Means and Aids of Grace, Faith, Perseverance; "and a special absolute Decree of Condemning them whom "he foresaw to abide Impenitent in their Sins. Would not any Man in the World think that we should have had the places quoted out of *Melanchthon*, or some other *Lutheran* Divine, in which these things are affirmed? but no such quotation is made, or so much as attempted; only in the Margin we are referred to *Apello Evangelium, cap.* 4. as if all that Mr. *Playfer* saith concerning the *Lutherans* were as true as Gospel, and must be believed without any examination. Mr. *Playfer* hath four considerable Arguments against this, which with him is the fourth Opinion, why are none of them answered? For my part I see not what there is in these passages, which the most strait, narrow-throated *Calvinist* may not swallow; for it is not here said, that there is no other Decree of Election but that mentioned; and the *Calvinist* will readily acknowledge, that God hath decreed to save Man-kind under the condition of Faith and Perseverance; but he will also maintain, that there is another Decree by which God hath determined to bestow Faith, and Perseverance in Faith, on a certain number, *viz.* all his Elect. Bate us but the impropriety of the phrases used in this addition, which is so great, that the Decrees of Election and Reprobation seem confounded with Justification and Condemnation, and we shall all of us subscribe to it. But to speak more distinctly about the *Augustan* Confession; the composition of it we owe to the joynt endeavors of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and *Pomeranus* (*Justus Jonas* being absent when these three set about the work) but *Melanchthon* did most in the business, a man whose both Learning and Piety were admirable; but being of too timorous a spirit, he so drew up the *Confession*, which is also called an *Apology*, as that he seemed to some not to keep distance enough from the Papists, which made his Friends blame him; nor had it any good effect upon his Adversa-

they and 2 things

versaries. Pope *Pius* V. in an Epistle to *Sigismund* King of *Poland* thus writing: *Augustana Confusio* (so he calls it, and not *Confessio*) *etsi similis est cæteris Hæresium pravitatibus, tamen ob eam causam periculosior est quod levius quam cæteræ à Catholica Fidei professione declinans, speciem quandam Religionis retinere videatur; eo pernitiosior aliis quo venenum ejus occultius latet, nec emiget foras.*

So true is the common saying, *Media via, neque amicos parit, neque inimicos tollit.* *Grotius* indeed tells us in his *Votum pro pace*, that the Anathemaes of the *Trent* Council were not directed against the *Augustan* Confession, but against the sayings of some private Persons; and that *Charls* the Emperor did interceed at *Rome*, that the *Augustan* Confession might not be put among prohibited Books: But in this, as in most things that did pass between him and *Rivet*, he doth but delude his Reader: no man that reads over the *Trent* Canons can choose but see, that some of them are directed against the *Augustan* Confession: As for the Emperor, that ever he made any such Intercession, it appears not; if he did, he had sure altered his mind, when he commanded that a Confutation of the *Augustan Confession* should be written: at least this is certain, that the Emperor's Intercession availed not; for it is sufficiently known, that the Confession is put among the prohibited Books. I have by me an Index of prohibited Books, Printed at *Antwerp* 1570. but approved by Pope *Pius* IV. *Anno* 1554. in which I find prohibited, page 16. *Apologia Confessionis Augustanæ, Augustanæ Confessionis Ecclesiarum causæ quare & amplexæ sint, & retinendam durant suam doctrinam.* And page 21. *Confessio Fidei Augustanæ.* Nor is it any wonder that the *Augustan* Confession is prohibited, seeing the Epistles of *Isaac Causabon* (who endeavored to oblige the Roman Catholicks as far as he could, without forsaking the communion of the Reformed Churches) are forbidden also. Doctor *Rivet*, in his Annotations on *Grotius's Cassander*, only tells us, that he had heard it so related; but *Hornebeck* had met with the Papal Bull itself, and exemplifieth it to the full, in his Disputation upon the Bull of Pope *Innocent* V. page 177, 178. It is most certain, that this Confession was never intended (whatever use be made of it now) to be *a perpetual rule, or symbole for all Protestant Churches*, for it was made in great haste. *Scripsi* (saith *Melanchon* in an

Epistle

Epistle to *Flacius*) *Augustanam Confessionem tunc cum haberem reprehensores multos, adjutorem neminem.* *Melchior Adam* in his life tells us he would often say, *That if he were to make, or draw up that Confession again, he would use more accuratenes then before he could possibly use.* In an Epistle to *Joachim. Camerarius*, *Ego mutabam, & refingebam pleraque quotidie. Plura etiam mutaturus, si nostri συμφράδμονες permisissent.* In an Epistle to *Luther* himself, *In Apologia quo tidie multa mutamus*, But take the Confession as now it is, there is nothing in it which a *Calvinist* may not well digest. I before noted that the *Piedmont* Churches, after they had most plainly declared themselves for *absolute election* and *perseverance*, do openly profess, that they embraced and adhered unto this *Augustan* Confession. *Calvin* himself, in an Epistle to *Schallingius*, *Anno* 1557. writes thus; *Nec vero Augustanam Confessionem repudio; cui pridem volens ac lubens subscripsi; sicut eam Author ipse interpretatus est.* *Zanchy* also subscribed it with this condition, *Modo Orthodoxe intelligatur*: which plainly shews, that he thought it capable of an Orthodox interpretation. If any of the *Calvinistical* persuasion have scrupled subscription, it hath been only on the account of the *Sacramentarian* Controversie, which hath no connexion with the five Points that we are now enquiring into. Our Quinquarticular Historian confesseth, that in the *Augustan* Confession nothing is said about Predestination; but we are told that *Melancthon*, in his writings, hath declared himself not to side with Mr. *Calvin*, but rather with *Arminius* in that Point; so *Grotius* had boasted of *Melancthon*; but *Lubbertus*, in his Answer to the *Pietas Grotii*, makes bold to tell him, that he was mistaken. *Errat si* Melancthonem *stare à remonstrantibus existimat.* To prove this he alledgeth *Melancthon* on the 9th. to the *Romans*, *cur nos vocavit ad Evangelium*, & *non vocavit* Alexandrum Macedonem, Augustum, Socratem, &c. *qui non minus civiliter vivebant quam nos; hic necesse est causam rejicere in voluntatem Dei*, & Jacob *electus est*, Esau *reprobatus priusquam quicquam boni vel mali fecissent; ergo opera non erant causa sed voluntas vocantis, non addam hic quomodo cavillentur ista nonnulli. Tantum hoc meminerit lector, opera secutura in vita erunt causa electionis, non licuit Apostolo dicere, non ex operibus.* Hence *Lubbertus* infers, that *Melancthon* was of *Luther*'s and *Calvin*'s mind in the Doctrine of Predestination; therefore the Papists in their writings stick

not to charge upon *Melancthon*, as well as others, that Blasphemy of making God the Author of Sin. But seeing Learned Men do so differ about *Melancthon*'s judgement in this matter, I could not be satisfied till I had made some further enquiry to the Epistles of *Calvin*; I betook my self, and read over all those that passed betwixt *Melancthon* and him; in which I found,

1. That the authority of *Melancthon* had been objected to *Calvin*, disputing about the secret will and providence of God, on which account *Calvin* was much troubled: this I gather from *Calvin*'s Letter to *Melancthon*, dated at *Geneva* the 4th. of the *Calends* of *Dec. Anno* 1552.

Quidam nebulones, quum nobis de gratuita Dei electione, & miseria humani arbitrii servitute, litem moverent, & publice tumultuarentur, nihil ad nos gravandos habuerunt magis plausibile nominis tui praetextu, quum experti essent, quam nobis promptum esset, quaecunque ingerebant commenta refellere, hoc sci: artificio nos obruere tentabant, nisi velimus palam abs te discedere, & ex quidem servata fuit à nobis moderatio, ut minime extorserint quod astutè captabant, professi ergo sumus, ego & collega omnes mei eundem quo tendis in doctrina scopum nobis esse propositum.

2. *Melancthon* did very studiously decline the full declaration of his judgement concerning *Predestination* and *Free-will*, and almost through all his writings so delivers himself, as to give men occasion to think, that he acknowledges no other Decree, but only that general Decree, *viz. to save all Believers*. So much may be gathered from the before mentioned Epistle. *Me non leviter pungit, quae in nostra docendi ratione, nimis palam conspicitur repugnantia. Equidem non ignoro si quid detur hominum authoritati, longe aequius esset, ut tibi subscribam, quam ut tu in sententiam meam descendas: verum id non agitur, neque à piis Christi ministris id optandum est; hoc scilicet quaeri utrinque decet, ut consentiamus in puram Dei veritatem. Me autem ut ingenuè fatear, religio impedit, ut tibi in hac doctrina parte accedam, quod nimis philosophice de libero arbitrio disputare videris, in electione tractanda nihil aliud habere propositum, nisi ut te ad communem hominum sensum accommodes, neque hallucinationi attribui hoc potest, quod homo acutus & prudens & in Scriptura prae exercitatus electionem Dei cum promissionibus confundit, quae sunt universae, nihil enim magis notum est quam verbi praedicatio*

dicationem omnibus promiscue esse communem, sed fidei Spiritum solis electis singulari privilegio donari, &c.

3. Mr. *Calvin* ever thought his Friend *Melanchton* rather to conceal his consent with him, then to dissent from him; so much we may collect from another of *Calvin*'s Epistles, bearing date at *Geneva* 6. *Cal.* of *Dec.* 1554.

Scribebam super de illo doctrinæ capite, in quo magis sensum tuum dissimulas, quam à nobis dissentis, quid enim aliud de homine acerrimi judicii, cœlestisque doctrinæ peritissimo arbitror, quam neminem mediocriter in sacris versatum latere, quod ipse quasi ignotum tegis, & tamen sundius perit gratuitæ Dei misericordiæ cognitio, nisi hoc tenemus, mero Dei beneplacito à reprobis discerni fideles, quos in salutem eligere voluit nisi & hoc deinde constat fidem ab arcana Dei electione manare, quia Spiritu suo illuminat, quos eligere antequam nascerentur, ei visum est, & adoptionis gratia in familiam suam inserit. Hanc doctrinam à summo Theologo convelli, quam absurdum sit, pro tua prudentia expende, manifestum certe dissidium in scriptis nostris notari, pessimi exempli esse vides.

4. All that Mr. *Calvin* desired, was but this, that *Melanchton* would declare his judgement about those matters, not questioning but it would be agreeable to his own, *Calv. ad Mel.* 3. *Nov. Martii* 1555. *Neque tamen importunius urgeo, sed quæ ad pace sua licet, etiam atque etiam te rogatum volim, ut recum de quibus scripsi, sacitus saltem expendas; sic enim operam se daturum confido, ut de gratuita piorum electione sincerior quam ante hac decendo forma inter nos mutuo conveniat.*

5. I found an Epistle of *Melanchton*'s, in which he declares to Mr. *Calvin*, that he had received his Book *de libero arbitrio* against *Pighius*, thanking him for the great commendations bestowed upon himself in the Preface to the Book; in the close of that Epistle he speaks something of the question of Predestination, still holding to his old way of discoursing concerning it, which he conceived to be most plain and fittest for the people; but withal affirming, that what he held, had nothing in it of contrariety to, or inconsistency with what Mr. *Calvin* held: his own words are these. *Quod ad quæstionem de prædestinatione, habebam* Tubingæ, *amicum doctum hominem* Franciscum Stadianum, *qui dicere solebat, se utrumque probare, convenire omnia, ut divina providentia decrevit, & tamen esse contingentia, sese hæc conciliare non posse. Ego cum hypothesin hanc*

tinam, Deum non esse causam peccati, nec velle peccatum, postea contingentiam in hac nostra infirmitate judicii admisto, ut sciant studes, Dacidem sua voluntate ultro ruere, & eundem sentio cum habetes Spiritum Sanctum, potuisse eum retinere, & in ea lustra aliquam esse voluntatis actionem. Hac etsamsi subtilius disputari possunt, tamen ad regendas mentes hoc modo proposita accommodata videntur. Accusemus ipsi nostram voluntatem tum labimur, non quaeramus in Dei consilio causam & contra eum nos erigamus, sciamus Deum & velle opitulari & adesse luctantibus μόνον βαλήσον, inquit Basilius, *θεὸς πρὸς ἀγῶνα excitetur ergo cura in nobis, & laudatur Dei immensa bonitas, quam & promisit auxilium & praestat, sed petentibus ut inquit Dominus hoc est iis qui promissionem intuentur. Nam à verbo Dei ordiendum est, nec repugnandum promissioni, sed ei assentiamur, nec disputemus antea tunc nos assensuros esse, cum arcanum decretum Dei nobis monstratum fuerit, adsentiemur autem Deus adjuvat, qui per verbum Dei est efficax. Hac non scribo ut tibi tradam quasi dictata homini & eruditissimo ac peritissimo exercitiorum pietatis. Et quidem scio hac cum tuis congruere, sed sunt παχύτερα & ad usum accommodata.* By which it appears, that *Melanchon* was of his Friends *Stadian* and *Calvin*'s mind, but was both to declare so much, because he saw the point was intricate and perplexed, and like to procure him much opposition; which was the cause also why he did not care to publish his mind about the Sacramentary Controversie, though it be well known, that in his latter days he was as much against Consubstantiation as *Calvin* himself: therefore the *Lutherans*, or rather *Anti-Lutherans*, do some of them distinguish betwixt *publick* and *private*. *Philip* and *Benedict Morgenstern* fear not to call *Melanchon*, The Plague of the *German* Churches, *Epist. ad Schlusselburgium.*

If any would know how *Calvin* resented *Melanchon*'s Answer about Free-will and Predestination, he may be informed from *Calvin*'s Letter, bearing date *June* 28. 1545. *De responso suo magnam habeo tibi gratiam, simul etiam de humanitate non vulgari, quam sibi abs te exhibitam fuisse* Claudius *testatur. Qualis erga me futurus esses inde conjecturam facio, quod meos tam benigne comiterque accipias. Deo autem maximas gratias agere non desino, qui dedit ut in ejus quaestionis summa, de qua rogati eramus, sententia nostra congruerent; tametsi enim paululum est discriminis in particulis quibusdam, de re tamen ipsa*

inter

inter nos optime convenit. Yet it seems by the former Letters, which are of a later date, that others did object *Melanchton* to *Calvin*, which made him so earnest with *Melanchton* to deliver his mind more clearly and plainly. If this give not the Reader so ample satisfaction as he desireth, he may please to consult such as have professedly made it their business to prove, that *Melanchton* was no *Arminian* in the five controverted Points; among whom I principally finde two recommended by the Learned *Rivet* in his Apologetique for Peace; *viz. Sopingius in Apologetica responsione ad bonam fidem Sibrandi* Lubberti *pag. 92, ad pag. 106.* And *Gaspar Peucerus*, the Son-in-law of *Melanchton*, who in an Epistle of his to *Jacobus Monavius*, by many Arguments labors to prove, that the Opinion of his Father and the *Geneva Divines* may easily be reconciled; and that they differ not so much in the things delivered, as in the way and manner of expressing and delivering them. If any one think this too much trouble, let him consult *Melanchton's* Epistle to *Brenius*, among those Printed at *Leyden* 1648. page 379. "Thou subtilly, and afar off, out of Predestination "gathereſt, that to every one his degree is distributed, and "thou reasonest rightly: but I in the whole Apology avoided "that long and inexplicable Controversie concerning Prede-"stination: I every where so speak, as if Predestination did "follow our Faith and Works; and I do this on purpose, for "I will not trouble Consciences with these inexplicable La-"byrinths.

Hunnius is thought to be, and that not without cause, a very *Rigid Lutheran*; yet hear what he saith in the beginning of his Theses: *Quod in divinis & spiritualibus rebus nullum sit arbitrium humanæ voluntatis, sed res de solo titulo, est id in nostris Ecclesiis extra dubitationem positum.* Et pag. 10. in his *Ne modiculum quidem illud de quo* Erasmus *disputat, superest bonitini suis viribus relicto, sed sunt hæc omnia ac solius Spiritus Sancti virtuti & operationi in solidum adscribenda.* I know some, and Doctor *Heylin* for one page 6. do make as if *Luther* did retract his Book *De servo arbitrio*; but that is a most gross mistake, there being no Book that he did more glory in then that and his Catechism, as is evident by a Letter written to *Capito* in the year 1539. which was but 7. years before his death, *De tomis meorum librorum disponendis frigidior sum & segnior; eo quod Satanissa sanè pertinax magis contra omnes decertat: nullum*

eoeum enim agnosco meum ipsum librum esse scilicet De servo arbitrio & Catechismum. The Duke of *Saxony* in the Preface to the *Corp. Doct.* writes, *That they are bewitched with the frauds of the Devil, who say that* Luther's *Book was ever retracted.* *Schlusselburgh* in his Catalogue of Heretick, *lib.* 4. *pag.* 254. affirms, *That the evil spirit cannot excogitate a more evident lye than this, that* Luther *recanted his opinion De servo arbitrio.* The Divines of *Saxony*, *in Colloquio Aldon.* account all them *Thieves*, *Robbers*, and *Sacrilegious Persons*, *who repudiate the Book* De servo Arbitrio, *or endeavor to alienate the* Lutheran *Church from it.* Now, I think, they that hold with *Calvin* in the point of Free-will, cannot (if they will be true to their own Principle) dissent from him in the point of Predestination.

Object. But the *Augustan* Confession plainly condemns the *Anabaptists*, *who teach*, *That a man once justified*, *can by no means lose the Holy Ghost*: Therefore certainly the Composers of it did not hold Perseverance in such a way as is commonly taught in the Schools of the *Calvinists*.

Answ. I must confess this is a specious Objection, and such as at the first reading of it puzzled me; I understood not presently, how the *Anabaptists* could with truth be charged to hold, *that a man once justified*, *can by no means lose the Holy Ghost*; it being rather the opinion of the *Anabaptists*, *that a man once justified*, *may lose the Holy Ghost*: Which made me think, there was some mistake in the printed Copies which we do commonly use; or else, that this was some expression that dropped from *Melanchton* in haste. I looked over the seventeen Articles that were drawn up by *Luther*, out of which *Melanchton* composed the *Augustan* Confession; in them I found not this expression, nor any like it: But yet I dared not to lay much stress upon this my conceit, because I knew the Anabaptists were a giddy Crew, and might differ among themselves, as well as from others; and upon examination, I found that there were *Valentinian Anabaptists* in those days, who taught *that when once a man was regenerate, and had obtained the Holy Ghost, he might live as he listed, and do what he would, for sin could not hurt him.* Such Anabaptists the Calvinists do as perfectly abhor, and would as soon condemn, as the most violent Lutherans: for Calvinists do not affirm, that *his regenerate men do what they list, and take what courses they please, they should con-*

tinue

thus in God's grace and favor: but they teach, that *he who hath the spirit, walketh after the spirit, and shall by God be made so to do.* When it was objected by *Bertius* to *Grotius*, the learned professor of *Breme*, that he in maintaining Perseverance, did contradict the eleventh Article of the *Augustan* Confession, how doth he clear himself? thus: *de Persev. Sanct.* lib. 5. cap. 5. pag. 585. *Etsi Articulus undecimus confessionis ipsius damnet Anabaptistas, qui negant semel justificatos iterum posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum, tamen, id meam mentem non tangit quippe quæ non vult idem quod Anabaptista, horum enim multi omnis generis fulgitiis se audacter obstringunt, more Barbaritarum, ubique se inquinare opinantur, quod Spiritum Sanctum habeant, quomodo cuique evoant ab iste errore horret animus.* Thus this learned Professor. And if there were nothing else, this one Argument would be to me sufficient to prove, that in the *Augustan Confession* there is nothing contrary to the conceptions of the *Zuinglians* or the *Calvinists* about the five Points, *viz.* That the very year before that *Confession* was presented to *Cæsar*, there was a Colloquy betwixt the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*, in which it must not be denied, but that there was too great and scandalous a difference betwixt them in the Sacramentary Doctrine, nor could it well be conceived that it should be otherwise; for *Luther* had written to the Landgrave of *Hesse*, that *the Helvetians would scarcely be brought to acknowledg their errors; and he for his part could not possibly lay aside the opinion which he had embraced.* And as soon as he met with *Bucer* thought meet to bestow no better compliment on him then this, that he was *homo nequam, & nebulo: i. e.* in plain English, *a very Knave:* But yet, both by what *Philip Melanchton* writes to *John* Duke of *Saxony*, and by what *Oecolampadius* writes to *Bertholdus Hallerus*, a Preacher at *Breme*, it appears, *that there was a sweet agreement betwixt the Divines on both sides about other matters*; fourteen Articles were subscribed to, the sixth whereof is this, *quod Fides sit donum Dei*, &c. *Faith is the gift of God, which we obtain by no precedent works or merits, nor attain by our own proper strength; but the holy Spirit giveth and worketh Faith in our hearts when we hear the Gospel, or word of Christ*; which if our *Arminians* would heartily acknowledg, who is he that would deny them the *right hand of fellowship?*

Moreover, the later Brood of *Lutherans* may do well to observe

tive, that harsher speeches do not occur in any *Calvinist* than are to be found in *Luther* himself; and that he, as well as *John Calvin*, was charged to make God the Author of Sin, and to put contrary wills in God, as may be seen 2. *Tom. Epist. pag.* 281.

Is not this enough? why then let us proceed further, even to that second meeting at *Torga*, held, as I take it, in the year 1576. in which these six men were Presidents, *Jacobus Andreas, Chemnitius, Selneccerus, Chyraus, Musculus, Cruciger*, and composed that Book which is called *Liber Concordiæ*, which contains in it, besides the *Apostolical, Nicene, Athanasian Creeds, the Augustan Confession, the Smalcaldian Articles, the two Catechisms of* Luther, *&c. a solid, full, clear repetition and declaration of those Articles of the Augustan Confession, about which there had been any controversie among Divines.* If the *Arminians* should have recourse to this Concord, all which they would get, might (as we say) be put into their eyes, and they see never a whit the worse: The Doctrine of Free-will is laid down as Calvinistically as one would wish for.

1. "'Tis said, that the understanding and reason of man "are altogether blind in things spiritual.

2. "That the will of man not yet renewed, is not only a-"verse to God, but also inimicous unto God, so as that a man "not renewed can only will and desire, and delight in those "things which are evil and repugnant to the Divine Will; "and that as much as a dead Body is unable to vivifie or re-"store it self unto a corporal life, so much is a man who is "dead in sins and trespasses, unable to bring himself to a spi-"ritual life.

3. "The Composers of that Concord do reject expressly "the Error of the Pelagians, and Semipelagians, and the O-"pinion of those who teach, that a man not renewed by rea-"son of his Free-will, is indeed weaker then to be able to "make the beginning of his own Conversion; or to turn "himself to God by his own proper strength, and obey the "Law of God with his whole heart; but yet if the Spirit of "God, by the preaching of the Word, have laid the founda-"tion of Conversion, and offered his Grace in the Word "preached unto man, then mans Will doth contribute some-"thing, though it be but very little to Conversion, by help-"ing it on, and cooperating to the perfection and comple-"ment o fit.

4. "The

4. "The said Composers do reject the speeches of those "who say, that the Will of man before Conversion, in Con-"version, after Conversion, doth repugn the holy Spirit, and "that the holy Spirit is given to those who do onset, purpose, "and pertinaciously resist him; these speeches they reject, "because God in the conversion of men, of unwilling makes "them willing.

5. "They further judge, that those speeches of the anci-"ents, *Deus trahit sed volentem trahit*, & *hominis voluntas in* "*conversione non est otiosa sed aliquid agit*, are not agreeable "to the form of sound words; and therefore that we must ab-"stain from them.

As to the Doctrine of Predestination, 'tis so soberly and modestly laid down, that a *Calvinist* may make a very fair interpretation of it, and subscribe unto it: this I had thought to have shewn, but I am prevented by the incomparable *Zanchy*, who descanting upon the agreement made betwixt the Divines and Professors of the Church and School of *Argentine*, *Anno* 1563. concerning the Divine Prescience and Predestination, doth also teach us how to interpret the Book of Concord; which yet, all things considered, might better have been called the Book of Discord; so much variance did it create among those whose Wisdom and Piety it would have been to unite against the common Enemies of Reformation.

Here it may not be amiss to take notice, that when *Marbachius*, about the years 1561, 1562, did accuse *Zanchy*'s Doctrine of Predestination as heretical, the judgement of Churches, and Universities, and private learned Men was desired, and the *University and Church of Marpurg*, *the School and Church of Heidelberg*, *the Church of Scaphusium*, *the Tigurine Church and School*, *the Church and University of Basil*, besides many private Persons, did justifie him, as may be seen in his second Book of *Miscellanies*, pag. 79, 80, &c.

Object. But do not many of the Lutherans decry *Calvins* Doctrine of Predestination as injurious to God, and destructive of the power and practice of godliness?

Answ. I must needs acknowledge they do, and that at such a rate and height, that they have in virulence exceeded most of the Papists; like deaf adders they seem to have stopped their ears against the voice of all those who would have charmd them into any moderation; and to have that alway written upon their

their hearts, which once dropped from *Luther*'s Pen in a fit of passion; *Blessed is the man who hath not gone in the counsel of the Sacramentarians, nor stood in the way of the Zuinglians, nor sate in the seat of the Tigurines.*

Epist. ad Jacob. præpositum Brem.

The first set and solemn Dispute I find betwixt *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* about Predestination happened in the year 1586. and was managed principally by the learned *Theodore Beza*, and *Jacobus Andreas*, a man of mean birth, but advanced at last to be Chancellor of *Tubing*; the place *Mompelguard*, the occasion such, as that no good success could be expected from it. *Frederick* the Prince was from his youth trained up and instructed in the *Ubiquitarian Doctrine*, but by going to *Berne* and *Geneva*, and frequent hearing the Lectures and Sermons of *Beza*, began to have some more favorable thoughts of the *Calvinists*, and therefore gave entertainment to some French exiles at *Mompelguard*; but as soon as it was buzzed into his ear, that *the Duke of* Wittenberg *had no Heir-male, that the* Austrians *would never endure him to be Successor if he favored the* Hugonots; *and that he was already suspected so to do, both because he had been at* Geneva, *and also because he had received and given entertainment to the French Protestants.* Upon these reasons he yielded to the Conference, not to find out truth, but to purge himself from any suspition of being Calvinistically affected. I would not have charged so great a Prince with so carnal a design, but that *Scultetus*, in the History of his own life, *page* 28. assures me, that *Tossanus* told all this in his hearing to *Pezelius*: and indeed by reading the conference it self, as related by *Lucas Osiander*, I found reason to suspect some such design; for whereas the Prince, in his Letters missive inviting to the Conference, mentioned no other cause of it, but the unhappy controversie about the Lords Supper; *Beza* and his Associates must at the Conference be put upon it unpreparedly to discourse about Predestination: and the Prince, as if he could not in conscience endure to hear *Beza*'s blasphemies, (forsooth) must offer to put an end to his Speech, had not *Andreas* (who was confident he should be able to answer him) desired his Highness not to give him any interruption, least afterwards it should be said, that *Beza* was not sufficiently heard in so weighty and great a matter: And yet I observe, that

that *Andreas* so declareth himself about the Doctrine of Election, as that *Beza* saw no reason to contradict him. *Andreas* his Positions are these:

1. *Deus salvandos non modo præscivit, sed eiam ab æterno elegit, ut ad vitam æternam prædestinavit.*

2. *Electio facta est in Christo, priusquam fundamenta mundi posita sunt, hoc est ut per Christum salvarentur.*

3. *Salvandorum apud Deum certus est numerus.*

These things he layeth down as matters that come not under any Dispute: *Beza* contradicts not any one of these, nor had he any reason to contradict them. But *Andreas* saith, *This is the question, Whether God have so predestinated his own Elect to eternal Life, as that he hath also destinated some, and the greater part of mankind, before they were born, to eternal Condemnation, and that by his absolute and hidden decree, so as that he would not have them repent, be converted and saved.* This he denieth, and so would any Calvinist that is in his wits, till the terms be distinguished. I do challenge all the Jesuits and Arminians now living, to name and shew me that man who hath in Print ventured to affirm, That God did Decree to Damn any one single Person but for Sin. When it is charged on us, that we say, God would not have men Repent, What is the meaning? Is this it? That there are some whose Impenitence God resolves not to cure, unto whom he decreed not to give the Grace of Repentance? Why who can question this? If the meaning be, that there are some whom God never put under an obligation to Repent, unto whom he never made Repentance a duty, I must needs say, I am yet to learn the name of that Divine who hath affirmed any such thing. Alas! that Scholars should not distinguish betwixt *Gods will of purpose determining of events*, and his *legislative will determining of the creatures duty*, or once imagine that *there is a contrariety betwixt these two wills.* The Conference ended, *Beza* desired that notwithstanding any difference, they might still look upon one another as Brethren; which *Andreas* would not yield to, offering *Beza dextram humanitatis*, but not *dextram fraternitatis.*

The sum of all that I would have observed concerning the Lutherans, is, That the more ancient of them do not differ from the Calvinists in the Articles of *Predestination* or *Perseverance*; the latter do differ from them somewhat (though not so much

as the Arminians) in both: yet the latter and worse sort of Lutherans, do so lay down the Doctrine of *Free-will*, that they may easily be driven to grant both *absolute Election*, and *absolute eternal Non-election*, or *Preterition*? For as *Hornbeck* well *Summa Contro. pag.* 716, 717. "This being once granted, "that it is not by our own strength or concourse that we are "converted, but only and meerly by the grace and operation "of the Spirit; it follows, that men cannot be converted but "by this his grace, and that they are then only converted "when this grace is given: Now all are not converted, "but some; to some therefore, and not to all, is this grace "given. Could not God give the same grace of Conversion "to others? He could doubtless, but doth not. If he doth "not, it is because he would not. Whatever God doth not in "time do, he from all eternity decreed and purposed not to "do: If God from all eternity decreed not to give his grace, "he did also, I trow, decree not to grant them salvation; for "for salvation is never promised but to the converted.

By this time it appears that the Doctor and his Party have little reason to lay any claim to the Augustan Confession, or those who glory in following it. But if it were granted, that the Composers of this Augustan Confession did symbolize with the Arminians in the five Points; yet it would be remembred, that there are extant other Protestant Confessions as ancient as the Augustan Confession, in which the Doctrine of Gods Decree is laid down very Calvinistically: In the Confession of *Basil*, there are these words which the Arminian ear cannot hear; *Confitemur, Deum, antequam mundum creassit, eos omnes elegisse, quos hæreditate æternæ salutis donare voluit.*

Confitemur, hominem ab initio secundum Dei imaginem, justitiam & sanctitatem integre factum: Est autem sua sponte lapsus in peccatum per quem lapsum totum humanum genus corruptum, damnationi obnoxium factum est etiamque natura nostra vitiata est, ac in tantam propensionem ad peccandum devenit, ut nisi eadem per Spiritum Sanctum redintegretur, homo per se nihil boni faciat, nec velit.

"I now return to the Historian, who *page* 34. thus proceeds: For the better carrying on of my design, I must go "back again to *Calvin*, whom I left under suspition of making "God to be Author of Sin, from which though many have "took much pains (none more then industrious Dr. *Field*)

to

"to absolve and free him; yet by his Doctrine of Predesti-
"nation, he hath laid such grounds as have involved his fol-
"lowers in the same guilt also.

He had left *Calvin* under *a suspition of making God the Author of Sin*: Why but *under a suspition*? Had he not *totidem terminis* placed him among those who *by necessary consequence did make God the Author of Sin*? And sith other Divines, as vehement maintainers of *Hierarchy* and *Ceremonies* as himself, have thought it their duty, and the Churches interest, to clear *Calvin* from the odious imputation of making God the Author of Sin, why doth he take so much pains to prove that great Reformer guilty of so horrid a Blasphemy? at least he should have shewed us, that Dr. *Field* and those other learned Men did but *lateram laváre*, by confuting what they urge for the justification of *Calvin*; but not thinking meet so to do, he contents himself to bring one Reason (such as it is) to prove that *Calvin* in his Doctrine of Predestination hath laid such grounds, as have involved all his Followers in the guilt of making God the Author of Sin: "*Ibid.* Not content to tra-
"vel a known and beaten way, he must needs find out a way
"by himself, which neither the Dominicans nor any other
"of the Followers of St. *Augustine*'s Rigors had found out be-
"fore, in making God to lay on *Adam* an unavoidable ne-
"cessity of falling into Sin and Misery, that so he might have
"opportunity to manifest his Mercy in the Electing of some
"few of his Posterity, and his Justice in the absolute Reject-
"ing of all the rest.

A very high charge; which if it be not made good, all must needs say, that Dr. *Heylin*'s heart did not much stand in awe of that Precept, *Thou shalt not bear false witness*: and made good it is not to be sure, for we are not so much as directed to any of Mr. *Calvin*'s Works in which these words, or any words of like import are to be found; this is sufficient Answer: but yet we will a little scan the Opinion here laid down by our Historian, and examine wherein the heinousness and singularity of it doth lie. Is this the heinousness of it, *That man being fallen, God should design to glorifie his Mercy in the electing of some, but Justice in the passing by of others*? I should rather think it had been a crime to say, that God would ever have suffered the fall, had he not known how, and actually intended to bring about his glory by it: Is it strange

that he should choose to shew his Mercy in electing but of a few, and his Justice in the rejecting of the greatest part of men? to me this is not strange; for when all are alike obnoxious, and of themselves unmeet for Mercy, what more injustice is there in rejecting millions of men, than in rejecting of one single man? I, but this is harsh, *that God should lay on* Adam *an unavoidable necessity of falling into Sin and Misery:* perhaps if it had been said, that God had laid on *Adam* an *avoidable necessity*, it would have well enough pleased the Doctor; but then others would have thought that an *avoidable necessity* had bordered a little too near the coasts of non-sense and contradiction. But is it not unworthy of God, to say, that *he did lay on* Adam *a necessity of falling into Sin and Misery?* not unworthy of him to be sure to lay a necessity of being miserable in case he sinned: Some rather question, Whether it would not have been unworthy of him to let sinful man pass without punishment, unless on some such valuable consideration as the suffering of a Mediator. As for laying a necessity on *Adam* of falling into Sin, that is indeed an uncoth phrase; and if the meaning of it be this, that God compelled *Adam*, of himself unwilling, to fall, I have not charity enough to excuse it of Blasphemy. But, as I said before, we are not told where the phrase occurs in Mr. *Calvin*; this seemeth to be the whole of his opinion, *That God did eternally decree to permit the fall of* Adam; *and God having decreed to permit his fall, it was necessary he should fall.* That man, whom we shall shortly have our Historian endeavoring to justifie, *Arminius*, hath laid it down as a truth, *That if God permits a man to will this or that, it must needs be that no kind of argument can move him not to will it.*

D. H.

"*Ibid.* In which as he can find no countenance from any "of the ancient Writers, so he pretendeth not to any ground "for it in the holy Scriptures; for whereas some objected on "God's behalf *decretis* (*disertis* he should have written) *verbis* "*non extare*, that the decree of *Adam*'s fall, and consequently "the involving of his whole Posterity in sin and misery, had "no foundation in the express words of holy Writ; he makes "no other answer to it, then a *quasi vero*; as if (saith he)

"God

"God made and created man, the most exact piece of his "workmanship, without determining of his end.

In *which we be can find*: In what doth the Doctor mean? nothing till now hath he quoted out of *Calvin*, and that Chapter which he now refers us to, *viz.* Chapter 23. *lib.* 3. *Institut.* manifests that Mr. *Calvin* had some countenance from St. *Augustin*, who is one of the ancient Writers, for in all his Answers to the Objections of his Adversaries, he fortifieth himself with the Authority of *Augustin*. Well, however we will consider the Objection made by *Calvin* against himself, and his Answer to it, *Disertis verbis hoc extare negant decretum fuisse à Deo ut sua defectione perires* Adam; that's the Objection which our Historian either would not or could not rightly translate. What is the Answer? *Quasi vero idem ille Deus quem Scriptura prædicat facere quæcunque vult, ambiguo sine condiderit nobilissimam ex suis creaturis.* Who seeth not that the Answer doth most fully enervate the Objection? who seeth not that Mr. *Calvin* doth here quote Scripture, and Scripture from which (if it be to be understood as he understands it) it necessarily follows, that God did decree and will that *Adam* should fall, and by his fall perish? He advanceth another Objection against himself in the words immediately following; *They say he had Free-will to make his own fortune, and that God decreed nothing but only to handle or deal with him according to his deserts.*

"If so cold a figment be received (saith *Calvin*) where will "be that Omnipotence of God, by which he moderates all "things according to his hidden counsel, which depends on "nothing else? but Predestination, whether they will or no, "discovereth it self in the Posterity of *Adam*; for it did not "come to pass by any natural necessity, that all should fall "from happiness by the fault of one: What makes them they "will not confess that concerning one man, which whether "they will or no they must yield of all mankind? Why should "they lose their labor by tergiversation? The Scripture pro-"claims, that all Mortals, in the person of one Man, were "adjuged to Eternal Death; this seeing it cannot be ascribed "to Nature, comes plainly from the admirable Coun-"sel of God, &c. What sayest, Reader? was it not an im-modest calumny to affirm, that Mr. *Calvin* pretends not to have any ground for his Opinion in the holy Scriptures?

D. H. page 36.

"Whereas others had objected, on God's behalf, no such "unavoidable necessity was laid on mankind by the will of "God; but rather that he was created by God unto such a "perishing estate; becaus he foresaw to what his own per-"verseness at the last would bring him. He answereth, that "this Objection proves nothing at all, or at least nothing to "the purpose. Which said, he tells us further out of *Valla*, "though otherwise not much versed in the holy Scriptures, "that this Question seems to be superfluous; because both "life and death are rather the acts of God's will, then of his "prescience or foreknowledg, &c.

For this, and what follows, we are referred to *lib.* 3. *cap.* 23. *sect.* 6. That Section I have read, and by reading of it have taken up this resolution, that I will never trust the Historian more. The Objection is framed in these words: *Si quis causetur nullam eis inferri necessitatem ex Dei providentia, sed potius in conditione ab ipso esse creatos quoniam futuram eorum prævisurum præviderit.* To which is answered, *Neque nihil dicit, neque totum.* That is, he neither *saith nothing*, *nor yet the whole.* Whose confidence, besides Dr. *Heylin's*, would have sufficed to English *Neque nihil dicit, neque totum?* He either saith nothing, or nothing to purpose. As for what is added out of *Valla*, 'tis undoubtedly a truth, that to appoint, or determine life or death, is rather an act of God's will than of his prescience: no wise man can think that life or death do depend on the Divine prescience.

D. H. Ibid.

"Notwithstanding all these shifts, he is forced to acknow-"ledge the Decree of *Adam's* fall, to be *Horribile Decretum*, "a Cruel and Horrible Decree; as indeed it is a cruel and "horrible Decree to pre-ordain so many millions to destru-"ction, and consequently unto sin, that he might destroy "them.

The expression of *Horribile Decretum* is indeed Mr. *Calvin's*, and glad I am that the Doctor takes notice of it, because Mr. *Pierce*, who drew him into the lists, makes such a noise about it, as also the Lutherans and *Grotius* had done long before him.

him. As for the Lutherans, I should think *Wendelin* in his Divinity, *Cap. de Reprobatione*, had written enough to stop their mouths; for he there produceth out of *Luther* (whom his Followers will scarcely acknowledge ever to have written a word amiss) several places, in which the word *Horribile* is used in the same sense that here it is by *Calvin*. As to Dr. *Heylin* and Mr. *Pierce*, I wonder why they should go about to persuade the World that *Calvin* by *Decretum Horribile*, intended a *Cruel and Horrible Decree*: Are *Horribile* & *Crudele*, a Way equivolent? God is not cruel, but righteous in all the torments that he hath laid on the fallen Angels; yet, I hope, one might venture to call them *Horribiles Cruciatus*. Who would construe *Horribile supplicium*, which sometimes occureth in good Authors, Cruel Punishment? The clamor that is made against Mr. *Calvin* for using the word *Horribile*, brings to my mind a prank that was plaid by some Sectaries in *Berkshire* against their Minister, (a man of good parts, and unblameable life;) they come and ask him, What was the meaning of the Psalmist in that phrase, *So he giveth his Beloved rest?* He unawares replied, It was a plaguy hard place; meaning, doubtless, no more, than that it was an huge hard place. But upon this, these malignant Sectaries betake themselves to the Commissioners for ejecting of ignorant and scandalous Ministers, and put in a complaint against their Parson; and make this one Article, That he had spoken blasphemously, or at least irreverently of the holy Scriptures. Some colour had these Sectaries for their simplicity or malice, because the word plaguy doth *male sonare*; but so doth not *Horribile*, signifying no more then that which doth *incutere horrorem*; therefore the outcries against *Calvin* for using it, and applying it to the Decree of Reprobation, are very vain, and apparently frivolous and malicious.

D. H. Ibid.

"A Doctrine so injurious to God, so destructive of Piety, "of such reproach amongst the Papists, and so offensive to "the Lutherans, of what sort soever, that they profess a "greater readiness to fall back to Popery, then to give way to "this Predestinarian pestilence (by which name they call it) "to come in amongst them.

Whether the Doctrine of Reprobation, or Rejection, as stated by *Calvin* and his Followers, be injurious to God, and destructive to Piety, shall be tried in the examination of what the Doctor hath compiled *out of God's love to mankind.* Now we shall be content to enquire, 1. Whether this Doctrine be of such reproach as is here intimated among Papists? 2. Whether it be so offensive to Lutherans?

1. If it be of reproach among the Papists, it is so without any cause: because men of the highest esteem and renown amongst them, say as much in this matter as ever did *Calvin*, or any of his Followers. This I would the rather prove, because it will wipe off the aspersion of singularity, which was in some former words most unjustly cast upon *Calvin*: Who are of greater esteem among the Papists then *Lombard*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Scotus*?

1. *Peter Lombard*, the Father of School-men, sirnamed (as every Fresh-man knows) the Master of the Sentences, who lived about the year 1140. thus determines, *Lib. 1. dist. 41. A. Cum gratiæ quæ apponuntur homini ad justificationem nulla sint merita, multo minus & ipsius prædestinationis (qua ab æterno Deus elegit quos voluit) aliqua possunt existere merita ita nec reprobationis quæ ab æterno præscivit quosdam futuros malos & damnandos; sicut elegit Jacob; & reprobavit Esau, quod non fuit pro meritis eorum quæ tunc habebant, quoniam nec ipsi existebant nec propter futura merita quæ præviderat vel illum elegit, vel illum reprobavit.*

2. *Thomas Aquinas*, the Angelical Doctor, Canonized by Pope *John* XXII. said to have got his Knowledge more by Prayer then Labour and Industry, upon whose Scholastical Labours are published as many Commentaries as on the holy Scripture, is rather an Hypercalvinian then not a Calvinist in this matter of the absolute Decree: The Supralapsarian way is by *Arminius*, in his Conference with *Junius*, imputed to him, lest *Arminius* should be thought so kind-hearted as to grant more then was needful. Let us hear *Matthæus Rispolis*, *Divus Thomas, ubicunque de ea re loquitur, semper docet, nullam esse causam reprobationis, sed sicut prædestinatio, ita & reprobatio, voluntatem Dei, ut causam habet. Quam opinionem sequuntur omnes Thomistæ & præcipue, &c. Lib. de Præsin. quæst. conclu.* 3. But it may be Reprobation is not the same thing with *Thomas* and *Calvin*; let *Aquinas* speak for himself, *part.* 1. q. 23.

q. 23. art. 3. *Reprobatio non nominat præscientiam tantum, sed aliquid addit secundum rationem, sicut & providentia: sicut enim prædestinatio includit voluntatem conferendi gratiam, ita reprobatio includit voluntatem permittendi aliquem cadere in culpam, & inferendi damnationis pœnam propter culpam.*

3. *Bonaventure*, Reader among Dr. *Heylin*'s Franciscan-Friers, much about the same time that *Aquinas* was Reader among the Dominick-Friers, canonized by Pope *Sixtus* IV. called generally the Seraphical Doctor, of so much sanctity of life, and integrity of manners, and profound knowledge, that his Master, *Alexander Ales*, was wont to say, *In hoc uno* Adam *non peccavit*, thus declares himself, *Lib. 1. disp. 40. q. 1. Simpliciter loquendo, quantum ad principale significatum, neutra* (i. e. *neque electio, neque reprobatio*) *cadit sub merito, quantum autem ad connotatum reprobatio cadit sub merito simpliciter prædestinatio vero secundum quid.* By the *principale significatum*, he means the Act or Decree of Reprobation; by the *connotatum*, he intendeth the effect of Reprobation, *viz.* Damnation.

4. Finally *Johannes Duns*, a man of stupendious subtlety, called by the admirable *Scaliger lima veritatis*, is very express and punctual for absolute Election and Reprobation; places twice ten might be produced, but it is needless to produce testimonies in a matter confessed by the Adversaries of the Absolute Decree: let *Micrælius* speak, *Heterodox. Cal. disp. 40. parag. 49. Scotus, alias Johannes Duns, Doctor ille & sæpe sæculo 14. contra Thomam defendit istam rigidam sententiam, quod, quicquid Deus operatur circa creaturas, operetur beneplacito voluntatis suæ, ut super hoc non sit ratio vel causa petenda, lib. 1. dist. 41. quodque Deus sola beneplacitis voluntate de tota massa perditæ voluerit quosdam homines misericorditer liberare, quosdam non, ut bonitatem manifestaret, in electis quidem per misericordiam; in reprobis per justitiam. Et cum alii Scholastici, ut Henricus, istam propositionem graviter argutarent, dicendo 1. defectum culpæ non requiri per se ad manifestationem bonitatis 2. malitiam in mundo & miseriam non esse de perfectione universi, & propterea non placuisse Deo simpliciter ut aliqui in malitia & miseria permanerent. 3. Dei intentionem non fuisse dum peccatum permittit ut habent quod punit sed ut bonum inde eliciat. 4. Malitiam prævisam esse rationem motivam ob quam damnare reprobos Deus constituerit.* Scotus hic

sese opposuit & defendit ille certam provisionem futurorum contingentium esse ex determinatione voluntatis divinæ, etsi offerantur duo æquales in naturalibus & ex iis unus præordinetur ad gratiam & vitam æternam, alter non, non esse aliam rationem assignandam nisi voluntatem divinam quæ quidem est ipsissima sententia Calvinianæ.

Is that a Doctrine of reproach among the Papists, that hath been defended by so many learned Doctors of the Papal Church? Perhaps though the Doctor will not account the Puritan Protestant worthy the name of a Protestant, yet he thinks the Puritan Papist, or Jesuit, the only Papist; if so, I cannot deny but that the Doctrine of absolute Reprobation is to them odious enough. *Molina* in his 23. Quest. Art. 4,5. having granted that his Schoolmen do commonly maintain absolute Reprobation, and not daring to deny but that *Austin* maintained it too, concludes, That *its too hard, and unworthy of the Divine goodness and clemency, more meet for a fierce and cruel, than for a most clement Prince, the Author of all consolation, goodness, piety.*

But yet I am sure *Bellarmine* and *Benedictus Pererius* were both Jesuits, and (if we may believe the judgement of learned men concerning them) as learned as any two that ever were of that Order; yet either I understand not their Latine (which is easie enough) or they do not speak with reproach concerning the absolute Decree. *Bellarm. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 2. cap. 16. Dicimus reprobationem duos actus comprehendere, alterum negativum, alterum positivum, siquidem reprobi, opponuntur electis contradictorie, & contrarie. Primum enim non habet Deus voluntatem illos salvandi, deinde habet voluntatem eos damnandi; quod attinet ad priorem actum, nulla datur ejus causa ex parte hominum, sicut neque prædestinationis. Benedictus Pererius* in his Comment. on the 9th. to the *Romans*, roundly takes up *Ambrosius Catharinus* for reproaching the opinion of the absolute Decree with those ugly names of *cruel, impious, desperate.*

2. The Doctor tells us that this Calvinistical Doctrine is offensive to the *Lutherans of what sort soever*; which whether he ever intended that we should believe, I know not; but I cannot in the least imagine that he himself believes it: for pag. 34. he told us of some *Rigid Lutherans, who having separated themselves from* Melancthon, *and the rest of the Divines of* Wittenberg,

renberg, *did gladly entertain those Doctrines, in which they were sure to find as good assistance as the Dominicans and their party could afford them.* What Doctrines were these in which they might promise themselves as good assistance as the Dominicans and their party could afford them, unless the Doctrine about the absolute Decrees, and some other points annexed to them? Not many lines after, it is acknowledged, that the Calvinian Factions (so the Doctor will misca) *Doctrines though condemned by the Counsel of* Trent, *yet found countenance not only from the whole Sect of Dominicans, but the Rigid Lutherans.* What! are the Calvinian Tenents countenanced *by a sort of Lutherans*, and yet offensive to Lutherans of *what sore favour?* This I'le undertake to prove, that unless the present Lutherans will reject the Opinion of *Luther, Brentius, Hoshusius*, men whom they pretend highly to reverence, the Calvinian opinion cannot be offensive to them: If therefore any of them have said or written, that they would sooner *fall back to Popery, then give way to this Predestinarian Pestilence*; they were sure in some high fit of passion, such as they are in when they speak of the Sacramentarian Pestilence; such as that Arminian was in, *who professed he would sooner turn Atheist than Calvinist.*

D. H. pag. 36, 37.

"Having so great a Founder as *Calvin* was, it came to be "generally entertained in all Churches of his plat-form; "strongly opposed by *Sebastian Castalio* in *Geneva* it self; "but the poor man so despightfully handled both by him and "*Beza*, that they never left pursuing him with complaints and "clamors, till they had cast him out of the City, and at last "brought him to his grave: The terror of which example, "and the great name which *Calvin* had attained unto, as it "confirmed his power at home, so did it make his Doctrines "the more acceptable and esteemed abroad.

Answ. Was ever more dirt cast into the face of *Calvin, Beza, Geneva*, and other Reformed Churches in so few lines? What were they who had suffered so many things from the bloodthirsty Papists, so startled with *Castalio*'s banishment, as not to dare to enquire into an opinion before they embraced it? Had all the Reformed pinned their faith on the sleeve of one man,

man, Who never made any pretence, or laid any claim to infallibility?

Be it so, that of what account the Master of the Sentences was in the Church of *Rome*, the same had *Calvin* amongst the Preachers of the Reformed Churches purchased; yet we know that the Papists themselves have their Points, in which they say that *hic Magister non tenetur*; so the Preachers of the Reformed Churches would undoubtedly have rejected *Calvin* in the Point of the absolute Decree, had they apprehended it to be either disconsonant from Scripture, or injurious to God, or destructive to the power of godliness. I cannot also but take notice of another Calumny, *viz.* That *the cause of the removal of* Castalio, *was his contradicting of* Calvin *and* Beza *in the Doctrine of God's Decrees*; whereas upon examination it will be found, that he was commanded to depart *Geneva* for his notorious Calumnies against those that had deserved better of the Church then himself: Indeed the man was grown to that impiety, that he feared not to call the *Divinely inspired Song of* Solomon, *an impure and obscene Ballad*; and to rail at, and reproach all those who would not consent to have it expunged the Canon: how great a Saint soever he may seem to some, the Histories of those times tell us, that he was *perjured*.

Page 37, 38.

Doctor *Heylin* takes notice, *That though Ecclesiastical Discipline was made use of to crush all those who durst oppose the Doctrine of* Calvin, *yet it was permitted* to Beza *to be somewhat milder then his Master, in placing the Decree of Predestination before the Fall, which* Calvin *himself had more rightly placed in Massa corrupta.* And yet *page* 38. *circa finem*, he tells us, *that the Doctrine of the Supralapsarians was first broached by* Calvin. [A contradiction so gross, that whosoever can reconcile it, must have a greater faculty then ever *Aristotle* himself pretended to, or thought possible. But let us to gratifie this Author, for once suppose that *John* was a *Sublapsarian*, and *Calvin* a *Supralapsarian*; yet it would require a greater charity then I could ever attain unto, to pardon his miscarriage in making the *Supralapsarian* Doctrine no older then Mr. *Calvin*: *Est nobis necessario fatendum, non esse super natam, aut ignobiliorum Theologorum sententiam, quæ ponit*

Pra-

Prædestinationem priorem prævisione peccati, saith Bishop *Davenant*, *Differt. de præd. & reprob. cap. 1. pag. 115.* This way went *Scotus*, gone to the generation of his Fathers some centuries before *Calvin*; yea, and *Aquinas* somewhat older then *Scotus*: and for a conclusion the Bishop addeth, *Hæc à me in eum finem adducuntur, non quod huic sententiæ adhæream, sed ut obiter perstringam illorum inscitiam, dicam an malitiam qui* Calvinum *aut* Bezam *lacerant maledictis quasi primarios hujus sententiæ Autores quæ inter Scholasticos & inter Pontifices ipsos non minus recepta est quam illa contraria quæ ponit hominem peccato infectum subjectum Prædestinationis.* Which done, he proceeds to produce two clear passages out of *Calvin*, by which it appears, that he made *massam corruptam*, or in *Austin*'s phrase, *massam damnatam*, the object of Predestination.

The next thing we shall take notice of in our Historian, is the account that he gives of the Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian Opinion, and the Arguments he brings against the one and the other: his account is drawn by the Pen of professed Adversaries, *viz.* the Remonstrants and *Tilenus*, his Arguments are all of them transcribed out of that English Pamphlet, called *God's love to mankind*; composed by the joint labours and endeavours of two Men that were no Punies in these Controversies, *viz.* Mr. *Mason* and Mr. *Herd*.

Where first I might take notice of this as one instance of his failing, that he hath not reckoned up all the Opinions about the object of Predestination; for as some make it to be *mankind not yet created, massam nondum conditam*; others mankind *created and corrupted*; so there are who make this object to be mankind *created indeed, but yet not corrupted or fallen*: nor are they who go this way so obscure as not to deserve to be mentioned by him that undertakes to write the History of these matters. But this I could easily pardon, did I not find him highly disingenuous in laying down the Opinion of the Supralapsarians, which he represents from their professed Enemies charge in the *Hague-Conference*; just as if some angry Neighbour having preferred a Bill against Dr. *Heylin*, and in that Bill charged him with more then could be proved, I should afterwards make use of this Charge as a Picture to draw Dr. *Heylin* by. A dispassionate Heathen would have had more candor then to Father upon any party of Men, every Beat which a provoked Adversary had laid at their door. What evidence

is

is there, that *the Opinion laid down by the Doctor*, page 38. *is the Opinion of the Supralapsarian Divines? Have all of them, or the most famous of them, either jointly or severally declared it to be their Opinion?* The Writings of some Antelapsarians I have read, and have not found that they have simply, and without distinction, asserted that God ordained *certain to eternal life*, *certain to eternal death*, without any regard had to *their righteousness or sin*, to *their obedience or disobedience*: Nay, they seem to me plainly to say, that God never decreed to bestow *salvation* on any adult person, but as *a reward of obedience*; nor to inflict *damnation* upon any person, but as *a reward of disobedience*. Only they say, If Election be considered *quoad actum elegentis*, and Reprobation *quoad actum reprobantis*, then there can be no cause assigned either of Election or Reprobation, but only the *will* and *pleasure* of the Almighty. *Res volita*; & *actus volendi*, should not be confounded in a Disputation so mysterious, as this about the eternal Decrees. Whereas therefore Dr. *Heylin*, page 38. adds, *That the Supralapsarian Doctrine first makes God to be the Author of Sin*; *as both* Piscator *and* Macatius, (*I suppose it should be* Maccovius) *and many other Supralapsarians, as well as Mr.* Perkins, *have positively and expressly affirmed him to be*; *and then concludes him for a more unmerciful Tyrant, than all that ever had been in the World, were they joyned together.* I do with some confidence aver, that this is a most manifest and malicious Calumny, exceeding (I think) all the Calumnies that ever were uttered by any Arminian. Mr. *Mason* in his Additions to Mr. *Hord* had said; *That none of the Supralapsarians* (Piscator *only and a few more of the Hunter sort excepted*) *had said directly, and* in terminis, *that God is the cause of sin.*

The Doctor hath changed Mr. *Mason's few* into *many*, and names *Maccovius* and Mr. *Perkins*, whereas Mr. *Mason* had only named *Piscator*: But this is strange, that neither Mr. *Mason* nor Dr. *Heylin* should direct us to any one place of these Authors, in which any such phrase or speech doth occur: Do they think that their Readers have leisure to turn over all the Writings of these *Blunter Supralapsarians*? or any divining faculty to find out, who are intended by the *few others, and the many others*? For my part I will not think that any one Supralapsarian ever affirmed God to be the *Author of*

Sin,

Sin, unless I see the very place in which such affirmation is contained. But should I see any such thing in the Writings of Mr. *Perkins*, I should be under a temptation to turn *Carnisian*, and disbelieve my eyes; so improbable, and almost impossible doth it seem to me, that a Person of his piety and learning should leave upon Record a Position so *senseless, absurd, impious.* I shall expect that the Doctor in some good convenient time do gather together those expressions of *Piscator, Maccovius, Perkins*, in which God is *expresly* made the Author of Sin, and publish them to the World, or else he must give the World leave to think, that he hath too much communion with the *Father of Lies.* Further I say, that it doth not from any Principle of the Supralapsarian follow, *either that God is the Author of Sin, or that he is a verier Tyrant than ever lived on Earth*; though I shall grant, that for man to do as God doth, would be the highest cruelty. I believe with the Supralapsarian, that God hath decreed not to bestow converting Grace upon many whom he could easily (had he so pleased) have converted. Should any man who could convert millions not convert them, and afterwards punish them with eternal torments for not being converted, he would be more cruel then ever *Nero* was. But is God therefore cruel, in not giving his converting Grace to those millions who perish eternally for it? Not at all: because he is not under a Law to contribute all that in him lieth towards the conversion of Souls; but so would man be if he had such a converting power. Suppose we that the Doctor had been endued with a power to work those wonderful things in *Tyre* and *Sidon*, which would have made the Inhabitants *repent in dust and ashes*, he would have been cruel with a witness had he not caused those wonders to be wrought; but I trow so was not God, though he never did, nor ever intended to work Miracle in either of those places.

Well, but the Doctor proceeds further, and tells us *page 39. sect. 7.* that *this extremity being every day found indefensible, the more moderate and sober sort of the Calvinians forsaking the Colours of their first Leaders, betook themselves into the Camp of the Rigid Lutherans; and rather choose to join with the Dominican Friers, than to stand to the Dictates of their Master Calvin.* It would be endless to discover all the weaknesses of this period. 1. *Calvin* was a Sublapsarian; therefore surely not

not the Master of the Supralapsarians. 2. The Dominican Friers do not all make the object of Predestination *massam corruptum*; nor yet the Rigid (if rigid) Lutherans. 3. Those that are Sublapsarians, do not judge the Supralapsarian way indefensible; witness *Davenant*, who hath defended the Supralapsarian way against the impertinent Objections of the Author of *God's Love to Mankind*; and yet was himself of the other perswasion.

Thus of the *Supralapsarians*; now follows the Evidence brought in against the *Sublapsarians*, and the Dreadful Sentence pronounced upon them. Witnesses against them, are the Remonstrants in the *Hague*. Confetence, published by *Bertius* and *Daniel Tilenus*; which our Historian hath taken word for word out of a supposititious *Tilenus*, who hath troubled himself and the world with an empty piece, called *Arcana Dogmata Contraremonstrantium*, or *The Calvinists Cabinet unlocked*, Printed for *Richard Royston*, 1659. having also Printed an *Examination of Tilenus* before the Triers of *Utopia*. Mr. *Baxter* in his Discovery of the *Grotian Religion*, charged this Gentleman with giving a false and odious account of the Doctrines of the Synod of *Dort*: He in his Defence alledgeth; that he never tied himself to the Decrees and Canons of that Synod. Yet Dr. *Heylin*, page 41. *calls them the Conclusions of the Synod of* Dort, *which is to be conceived to have delivered the genuine sence of all the Parties, as being a Representative of all the Calvinian Churches of* Europe, *except those of* France, *some few Divines of* England *being added to them.* The truth is, not one of his five Conclusions, *pag.* 41, 42. are the Conclusions of the Synod of *Dort*; nor as they are worded, are they so much as agreeable to the Conclusions of that Venerable Synod. The Judgement of the Synod of *Dort* in the first of the five Points, against which alone, or rather against one part of which alone, *viz.* that of Reprobation, the Arguments transcribed by the Doctor, *pag.* 42, 43, 44, 45. out of *God's Love to Mankind* do militate, though he through a stupendious inadvertence, speaks of them as alledged against the whole frame of the Synods Conclusion; the Judgement, I say, of the Synod, in the matter of the Divine Decrees, was as followeth.

Article

Article 7.

"Election is the unchangeable purpose of God, by which "before the foundation of the World, according to the most "free pleasure of his Will, and of his meer Grace, out of all "mankind, fallen through their own fault from their first in-"tegrity into sin and destruction, he hath chosen in Christ "unto salvation a set number of certain men, neither better "nor more worthy then others, but lying in the common "misery with others; which Christ also from all eternity be "appointed the Mediator and Head of all the Elect, and "Foundation of Salvation, and so he decreed to give them "to him to be saved, and by his Word and Spirit effectually "to call and draw them to a communion with him; *i. e.* to "give them a true Faith in him, to justifie, sanctifie, and "finally to glorifie them, being mightily kept in the communi-"on of his Son, to the demonstration of his mercy, and praise "of the riches of his glorious grace, *Ephes.* 1. 4, 5, 6. *Rom.* "8. 30.

Article 15.

"The holy Scripture herein chiefly manifests and commends "unto us this eternal and free grace of our Election, in that "it witnesseth, that not all men are elected, but some not "elected, or passed over in God's eternal election; whom "doubtless God in his most free, most just, unreprovable and "unchangeable good pleasure, hath decreed to leave in the "common misery, (whereinto by their own default they pre-"cipitated themselves) and not to bestow saving faith and the "the grace of conversion upon them; but leaving them in "their own ways, and under just judgement, at last to con-"demn and everlastingly punish them, not only for their un-"belief, but also for their other sins, to the manifestation of "his Justice.

The Reader may perhaps expect, that I should give him an account of the Judgement of the Reformed Gallican Churches in the five controverted Points; but *Grotius* in his Epistle to *N. N. Epist. Eccles. pag.* 746. hath saved me this labour, averring *that* Moulin, *a leading man in the Gallican Churches, was, though absent, a chief forger of the Canons of the Synod*

Synod of Dort, *and the only cause why they were without any examination received in France.* Only I must needs take notice of *Grotius* his calumniating humour, whilst he gives out, that the *Dort* Canons were received in the French Churches without any examination; "Whereas it is certain, that in the "National Synod at *Alet. Anno* 1620. the Canons of the "Synod of *Dort* were read, and expended severally and attentively, and by the common consent of all and every one "present approved, as agreeable to the Word of God, and "the Confession of the French Churches, as written purely "and wisely, and as meet to eliminate false Doctrine, and "to conserve true Doctrine: Every man also swearing, that "he did approve these Canons, and would according to his "strength, defend the same to his last breath. It was also "then ordained, that these Canons should be sworn to, and "subscribed by all that were afterwards to be admitted either "to the Ministry, or to any Office in the University. All this "was also confirmed in the next ensuing National Synod at "*Charenton*, *Anno* 1623. *Vid. Corp. Confess. edit. Genev. Anno* 1654. *Can. Dordrechtani*, *pag.* 55. it is here said, that the *Dort* Canons were agreeable to the former French Confessions of Faith: and that they were so, cannot be denied by any who will read the Confession of Faith exhibited to *Charles* IX. *Anno* 1561. for these are the words of that Confession, Article 12. *Credimus ex hac corruptione & damnatione universali in qua omnes homines natura sunt submersi, Deum alios quidem eripere, quos vi æterno & immutabili suo consilio, sola sua bonitate & misericordia, nulloque operum ipsorum respectu in Jesu Christo elegit: alios vero in ea corruptione & damnatione relinquere, in quibus nimirum juste suo tempore damnandis justitiam suam demonstret, sicut in aliis divitias misericordiæ suæ declarat. Neque enim alii aliis meliores sunt, donec illos Deus discernat ex immutabili illo consilio, quod ante seculorum creationem in Jesu Christo determinavit: neque posset quisquam sua vi sibi ad bonum illud aditum patefacere, quum ex natura nostra ut unum quidem rectum motum, vel affectum seu cogitationem habere possimus donec nos Deus gratis præveniat & ad rectitudinem formet.*

Against the absolute Decree, as stated by the Synod of *Dort*, and the French Divines, let us hear what can be objected *out of God's love to mankind*; for thence doth the

Doctor

Doctor transcribe as confidently, as if there had never any Answer been returned to that Book; whereas there are few Scholars (any way inquisitive after Books) who do not know, that it hath been answered by Bishop *Davenant*, Dr. *Twisse*, *Amyraldus*; not to mention Dr. *Ward* and Mr. *Aylesbury*, who have took occasion to refel *some of the Book*, though not all: It is out of that Pamphlet that the Sublapsarian opinion is argued against. As,

1. *Repugnant to plain Texts of Scripture*, Ezekiel 33. 11. Rom. 11. 32. 2 Joh. 3. 16. 2 Tim. 2. 4. 2 Pet. 3. 9. Gen. 4. 7. 1 Chron. 28. 9. 2 Chron. 15. 2. Now if it should prove contrary to any one of these Scriptures, it were meet to be abandoned by all good Christians: But many Opinions are confidently affirmed to be contrary to Scripture, which are not; such perhaps is this. I needed not to have said *perhaps*; for let it be remembred, that the Opinion of the Sublapsarians is but this, *That God hath decreed the infallible Conversion and Salvation of certain singular Persons, and also the permission of some Mens Impenitence and Perdition*; and it will soon be seen, that the Scriptures produced have not so much as a seeming contrariety to it.

1. *Ezek.* 33. 11. God saith, you sweareth, *That He hath no pleasure in the death of a Sinner*; therefore God never decreed to let sinful Creatures finally to run on in their wicked ways. What a wild conclusion is this? hence indeed it might be inferred, that neither Spiritual nor Eternal Death do fall under that Will of God, which is called his *Voluntas simplicis complacentiæ*. But Sublapsarians do not say, That they do fall under that Will; if they did, they must also necessarily maintain, that they be things in themselves good and lovely, which none of them (that ever I met with) do.

2. It is said, *Rom.* 11. 32. *God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.* What can hence be collected? *Why the two Alls are of equal extent; how many Unbelievers there be, on so many God hath a Will of shewing Mercy; and if every Man be under Mercy, then there is no precise Will of shutting out any from possibility of Mercy.*

Well, 1. Let it be remembred, that here it is granted, that God hath shut up all under unbelief; which is as high an expression concerning God's providence about, and concurrence unto evil, as any used by Mr. *Calvin*.

2. When it is said that God hath a Will of shewing Mercy on all Unbelievers: if by Mercy be understood a general Mercy, we can grant it, all Men are not only under a possibility of this Mercy, but also have some actual participations of it.

But thirdly, It is plain, that the Mercy intended in the Text, is not a general Mercy common to all Mankind; but such a Mercy as was never vouchsafed to some whole Nations, much less to every individual Member of those Nations. *V.* 30. *For as ye (i. e.* the Gentiles) *in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy.* Doubtless the mercy that the Gentiles obtained by the unbelief and hardness of the Jews, was the hearing of the Word, and that *which comes by hearing, even Faith.* The mercy also that the Jews obtained through the mercy of the Gentiles, was the being provoked to jealousie; the seeing of him whom they had crucified; and being in bitterness; the turning of them away from iniquity, and the turning of iniquity from them. Now, doth Dr. *Heylin* indeed think, that God did shut up every Jew and Gentile in unbelief, with a design and purpose to have the Gospel preached to the *singula genterum?* if so, he must unavoidably grant, that the Almighty is marvelously frustrated in his design and purpose; for he is too good a Geographer and Historian, to think that the Gospel was ever *preached*, or *entertained* by all men that have lived, or do now live in the World.

3. *John* 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.*

From hence it undeniably follows, that God will not damn any man meerly for not coming up to the terms of the old Covenant of Works; and that none shall perish, whose heart is brought to believe in Christ. Nor have the Contra-remonstrants denied this; and more than this cannot hence be inferred: For whereas Mr. *Hord* argueth, *God loved the whole lump of mankind, and loved it fallen into a gulf of sin and misery; he did not therefore hate the most of them lying in the fall; for love and hatred are contrary acts in God, and cannot be exercised about the same objects.* He sure could not but think, that we would reply, that God doth not love the whole lump of

of mankind with the same degree, measure, and kind of love; and that a less degree of love is sometimes in Scriptures called by the name of hatred. God had not such a love for the whole lump of mankind, as to decree to bestow upon every particular person that special grace which shall infallibly bring him to eternal life and glory: any love less then this, may consist with absolute, eternal non-election or preterition. Nay, God did never so love the whole World, as to purpose to bestow on all the parts of it the very means of knowledg: How many, notwithstanding the love this Text speaks of, are everlastingly punished, who never heard of the way to Salvation?

4. 1 *Tim.* 2. 4. *Who would have all to be saved, and to come to the knowledg of the truth. In these words the Apostle delivers two things: 1. That it is God's will that all men should obtain an happy end. 2. That it is his will also that they should use and enjoy the means, which is the knowledg of his truth, that they might attain the end: There is no let in God, but that all men may believe and be saved; and therefore there is no absolute will, that many thousands of men shall never believe, nor be saved.*

The thing that should be proved, is, That there is a will in God to save all men, and to bring them to the knowledg of the truth; and we have here a Scripture brought to prove, that God would have all men to be saved; as if there were no difference betwixt these two Propositions, *Deus vult omnes salvos fieri*; *Deus vult omnes salvos facere.* If a man should lay down this assertion, that Dr. *Heylin* hath a mind or purpose to bestow an hundred pounds *per annum* on *Abingdon*, and when he is called to make good that assertion, should only prove, that Dr. *Heylin* could be well pleased, that an 100. *per annum* were given to the Town, and that there is no let in him why it hath not been given, would he not become ridiculous? Never did sober Sublapsarian say, that there is any let in God; but that all men may believe and be saved: but they do not think, that a man must presently believe and be saved, if God do not hinder his faith and salvation; 'tis required that God should remove all the lets and hinderances of faith, cure us of our unbelief, and put his fear into our inward parts, else we shall never believe, or be saved. Let any Arminian prove, that God hath willed and purposed to do all this for every one.

5. 2 *Pet.* 3. 9. *Not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. This is a negative Proposition, and must be taken distributively; and therefore it flatly contradicteth absolute Reprobation.* Here is Logick that may well make younger men then Dr. *Heylin* and I to smile: The Scripture produced is not one Proposition, but two; and if the first be negative, the second is affirmative.

2. What if it be taken distributively? is there no distribution but only into the *singula generum*? I thought that there might be a distribution into *genera singulorum*.

3. I could (notwithstanding any thing brought by Mr. *Hord* to the contrary) hold, that the words are to be restrained to the Elect.

4. But because I can be not only honest, but also liberal, I will grant, that God is not willing that any one should perish, that he is willing that every one should repent: But then I deny, that either of these two Propositions do contradict Gods decree of Reprobation; which, as hath been often said, is his decree to permit, that many shall perish in their impenitence; mens being under this decree doth not hinder, but that God may *voluntate complacentiæ* will their conversion, and patiently expect it; and afford them such means as will leave them without excuse, though such as he foreknew they would frustrate and receive in vain. The conditional Texts of Scripture that follow are so apparently impertinent, that I will trust any Reader with them.

D. H. pag. 42, 43.

"The Sublapsarian Opinion fighteth with God's holiness, "and makes him the cause of sin in the greatest number of "men: 1. In regard that of his own will and pleasure, "he hath brought men into an estate, in which they cannot "avoid sin; that is to say, by imputing to them the trans-"gression of their Father *Adam*. 2. In that he leaves them "irrecoverably plunged and involved in it, without affording "them power or ability to rise again to newness of life: In "which case that of *Tertullian* seems to have been fitly al-"ledged, *In cujus manu est ne quid fiat ei deputatur cum "jam fit*; in whose power it is that a thing be not done, to "him it is imputed when it is done.

If

If absolute Reprobation do indeed rob God of his holiness, let it for ever be abandoned, and not so much as named with the least approbation among Divines. But what wretched ignorance is this! whilst a man is pleading for the holiness of his Maker, to lay down such a rule, which if it should prove true, doth entitle him to all the wickednesses that ever were perpetrated by the sons of men. I ask the Doctor, Could not he who kept the Heathenish King from touching *Abraham*'s Wife, *Laban* and *Esau* from doing mischief to *Jacob*, the Israelites Enemies from having so much as a mind to hurt them, so restrain the lust of all and every man, as that it should never conceive and bring forth sin and death? If he could not, he is not Omnipotent, nor fit to govern the World; if he could, sith he hath not, he is by the Doctor's rule, become the Author of all the pollutions that have been in the World through lust. The best is, the rule is most apparently false, even in reference to the creature; for a man is not guilty of all the sins which he had power to hinder, but only of those sins which by vertue of his calling and place he was bound to hinder. Let us see whether the Sublapsarians be more happy in their Principles then the Historian in his: Two Principles of theirs are taken notice of:

1. *That God of his own will and pleasure, hath brought men into an estate in which they cannot avoid sin; that is to say, by imputing to them the transgression of their Father* Adam.

Little did I expect to find this Principle charged with any opposition to the holiness of God; for though it be most unhandsomely expressed, yet that which is intended by it, is but this, that it was the free constitution of God, that if *Adam* stood, he should transmit holiness to all his Posterity; and if he did fall and rebel, then his Posterity should be born in a condition of sin and misery.

If this be a truth, then it is not contrary to the holiness of God; if not a truth, what shall become of *Rom.* 5. 12. let ἐφ' ᾧ be rendered either *in quo*, or *eo quod*, it must needs hold forth this, That when *Adam* sinned, we sinned; which could not be, if *Adam* had not been made by God a common Person, a fœderal as well as a natural head. If he was made a common Person, so as that his will was reputed our will, his fall our fall, he was made such by the meer will and pleasure of God; for who can think that there was any thing

that necessitated God to make him such? It may be the second Principle is more hainous; that is thus laid down.

He leaves men irrecoverably plunged and involved in sin, without affording them power or ability to rise again to newness of life.

If this be understood of all men, it is a notorious calumny; for the Sublapsarians hold, that there are a great number of men, upon whom God hath eternally purposed to bestow that grace which shall infallibly bring them out of sin and misery. But there are some to whom he affords no such power; Well, what then? Is he not therefore holy? *Absit.* If he had let all the race of mankind perish, never sending his Son to take flesh, and so become a Mediator betwixt God and man, he had notwithstanding been every way as holy as now he is. But it seems it is again come to that pass, that *Deus non erit Deus nisi homini placuerit*; God shall not be God (God he is not if he be not holy) unless he have made such Decrees as please our Semipelagians.

D. H. page 43.

"This Sublapsarian Doctrine is inconsistent with the mercy "of God, so highly signified in the Scripture, in making "him to take so small and speedy occasion to punish the "greater part of men for ever; and for one sin once com-"mitted, to shut them up under an invincible necessity of "sin and damnation.

Who would have looked for such stuff from the Pen of a Divine? If God make man after his own image, allow him liberty to eat of all the trees but one, and tell him most expressly, that if he eat of that tree, he shall die the death; must he needs be thought, if he punish man for ever for eating of that tree, to take a small occasion to punish man? Had not this eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree, all the circumstances in it that may render it out of measure sinful? had it not something in it contrary to all the Precepts of the natural Law? But besides, this charge of destroying God's mercy is grounded on a gross mistake; for Sublapsarians do no not make Reprobation to be God's punishing men for ever, or shutting them under an invincible necessity of sin and damnation; it is with them only the denying, or not giving of an undue favour, which yet he is pleased graciously

to

to vouchsafe to others, who could as little deserve it as those to whom it is denied.

D. H. Ibid.

"This is incompatible with the Justice of God, who is "said in Scripture to be righteous in all his ways, according "unto weight and measure, that the far greatest part of man-"kind should be left remediless in a state of damnation, for "the sin of their first Father only; That he should require "faith in Christ of those, to whom he hath precisely in his "absolute purpose denied both a power to believe, and a "Christ to believe in; or that he should punish men for the "omission of an act, which is made impossible for them by his "own decree; by which he purposed that they should par-"take with *Adam* in his sin, and be strip'd of all the super-"natural power which they had in him before he fell.

All this is but a bundle of *impertinencies*, *improprieties*, *calumnies*: no opinion destroys the Justice of God, but that which ascribes injustice to him; injustice is not ascribed to God, till he be affirmed to do something that is contrary to his goodness or his truth; which he is not by those who maintain his Decree of Reprobation. Sublapsarians do not say, that the far greatest part of mankind is left remedilesly in a state of damnation, for the sin of their first Father only; they affirm, that the first transgression was as truly the transgression of every one descended naturally from the loins of *Adam*, as of *Adam* himself the common Progenitor. They maintain not that any is left remediless in a state of damnation; they acknowledg, that a remedy is by God prepared sufficient to deliver them from the wrath to come; and that it is through the fault of men living in the Church, if this remedy become not effectual: They also make damnation to come upon the Reprobate, not because he is a Reprobate, nor meerly and solely for Original sin; but for other habitual and actual sins. It is also most false, that by the Sublapsarians God is made to require faith in Christ of those, to whom hath denied both a power to believe, and a Christ to believe in. Those who did never hear of Christ, are not required under pain of damnation to believe in him; faith to them is no duty, and therefore infidelity is no sin. Those to whom Christ is manifested,

have a Christ given them to believe in; for he is propounded to them, as able to save them to the uttermost, as willing and resolved, and engaged to save them upon his own terms; which are no other, then their receiving of him, and submitting to him, as their Lord to rule and govern them, &c. Yea, the Sublapsarians affirm God to give the Reprobate a power of believing, as great a power as the Arminians make him to give to any, whether Elect or Reprobate. God never purposed effectually to work in the Reprobate both to will and do, say the Sublapsarians: He never purposed effectually to work to will and to do in any, say the Arminians.

I, but God punisheth the Reprobates for the omission of an act, which is by his own Decree made impossible to them, say Sublapsarians; ergo he is unjust.

I deny the antecedent; some Sublapsarians say, that faith is not impossible to any who is in *statu viatoris*; no Sublapsarian saith, that it was the decree of God which made the act of faith impossible to any man: It is the corruption and hardness of mens hearts that makes the act of faith impossible to men (if absolutely it be impossible) but this corruption and hardness of mens hearts is not an effect of God's decree.

D. H. page 43.

"It is said to be destructive of God's sincerity, in calling "them to repentance, and to the knowledg of the faith in Jesus "Christ that they may be saved, to whom he doth not really "intend the salvation offered; which is as if a Creditor should "resolve upon no terms to forgive his Debtor, and yet make "him offers to remit the whole upon some condition, and "bind the same with many solemn oaths in a publick Audi-"tory.

This is indeed said (the more some mens shame and impudence) too too often, but it is not proved. Sublapsarians do not feign God to have any purpose to remit the debt upon no terms; they plainly say, that he hath purposed to remit it, on the conditions of faith and repentance; should any Reprobate perform and come up to these conditions, the whole sum, how great soever, should be forgiven him; and he put into the actual possession and enjoyment of the salvation offered to him in the preaching of the Gospel. [I, but these con-

conditions are such as God knows the Reprobate will not, cannot come up to; therefore to offer salvation on such terms, is but to delude.] Why, but did not God foreknow, in the Arminian way, that the Reprobate would not repent and believe? Ay; but they do not say, that God ever decreed that he should not repent and believe: Well, however he decreed not to cure his impenitence or unbelief. If this be granted, the Sublapsarian hath as much as he need contend for; Reprobation being with him, only a denial of that grace which makes men actually Believers. Judge now what cause the Doctor had, so reproachfully to conclude this piece of his Charge: *All God's passionate wishes, all his terrible threatnings, the whole course of the Ministry, are by this Doctrine made to be but so many acts of deep hypocrisie in Almighty God; though none of the maintainers of it have the ingenuity to confess the same, but* Piscator *only in his* Necesse est ut sanctam aliquam si mutationem (lege simulationem) in Deo statuamus; *which is plain and home.*

Some maintainers of absolute Reprobation do not deny this, but ascribe unto God Sanctam simulationem, duplicem personam, duplicem voluntatem, *saith* Mr. *Hord*. But Dr. *Heylin*, taking this to be a piece of commendable ingenuity, will not allow any but *Piscator* alone to have any portion of it; all others are disingenious, and do indeed make God a dissembler, but will not say so much. Surely did the Sublapsarians conceive that so horrid a consequence did follow upon absolute Reprobation, they would acknowledg it, and withal renounce and disclaim their opinion. Till they be thus convinced, it is no great charity to fasten disingenuity upon men so renowned for Learning and Piety, as are the Sublapsarians. But let us look once more on this scoffing passage; *All God's wishes*, &c. *must be but so many acts of deep hypocrisie; though none of the maintainers of this Opinion be so ingenious as to confess the same but* Piscator. The Opinion he is speaking of, is the Sublapsarian Opinion; and so the sense is, none of the Sublapsarian Opinion, save only *Piscator*, who was no Sublapsarian, but a Supralapsarian; Is not this fine sense? Besides *sanctam quandam simulationem*, cannot well be rendred by *deep hypocrisie*. Lastly, how shall I be assured that any such words as these here quoted, are to be found in *Piscator*? neither Page nor Book is quoted, yet I have

have met with the place; and by reading it can easily gather, that Dr. *Heylin* either never read it, or had not ingenuity enough to quote it aright: For whereas *Vorstius* had objected to *Piscator*, that he fastned simulation on God in the case of the *Ninevites*, and the message sent to *Hezekiah*, he replieth, *Tu hic pugnas sine adversario, nam neque ego affirmavi facile aliquam simulationis speciem Deo tribuendam esse, neque exempla illa* Ezekiæ & Ninevitarum *hac retuli: interim non puto ab illis exemplis alienum esse, ut sancta Dei simulatio in illis statuatur.* Here is no *necesse est*; nothing like an affirmation, that the maintainers of absolute Reprobation must necessarily ascribe a simulation unto God. Honest *Piscator* never dreamed that the message sent to *Hezekiah* by *Isaiah*, or to the *Ninevites* by *Jonah*, was the Decree of Reprobation; all he seems to intend, is but this, that God seemed in those messages to be peremptorily resolved of that, which he never resolved should come to pass: and if his expression were not so accurate, Dr. *Heylin*, who almost in every period lieth at the Readers mercy, should not have cavilled at it.

By the way let it be noted, that how sleightly soever our present Arminians do think or speak of *Piscator*, yet *Arminius* himself either had honourable thoughts of him, or else was a most notorious dissembler: For writing to *Utengobard* concerning one to succeed *Junius*, then lately dead, after mention of some other, he saith, *Si Piscatoris ætas non obstet, illum unum omnium commodissimum existimo quem etiam fors non admodum erit difficile à Comite Nassovio impetrare, si Comes Mauritius & D. Ordines intercedere non dedignabuntur, doctus est, diligens est, facilis, planus, & perspicuus. Nominis celebritatem sibi editis scriptis comparavit apud multos. Hoc potissimum videtur hoc Academiæ statu requiri, ut succedat qui possit locum pro dignitate tueri, unde tantus vir excessit, & quem posse publice innotuit.* The Letter beareth date 3. *Cal. Nov.* 1602. and is recorded *Epistol. Eccles. pag.* 134.

One Arrow more the Doctor hath to shoot at the absolute Decree, and then his Quiver is quite emptied.

D. H. page 44.

Finally, it is alledged, that this Doctrine of the Sublapsarians, is contrary to the ends by God proposed in the Word and Sacra-

ments,

ments, to many of God's excellent gifts to the souls of men, to all endeavors unto holiness and godly living, and to those grounds of comforts by which a conscience in distress should be relieved.

All this is indeed alledged by Mr. *Hord*, but it is denied also by all the Sublapsarians; and had the Doctor vouchsafed to bring Mr. *Hord*'s Reasons, they should have had their Answer; but where he counts it sufficient barely to affirm, there I count it enough to deny: But however, I shall take notice of two Stories; whereof the first is said to illustrate, the second to evince.

The illustrating History is concerning *Tiberius Cæsar*, of whom *Suetonius* saith, *Circa Deos, & Religiones negligentior erat, quippe additus Mathematicæ, persuasionisque plenus, omnia fato agi.*

The evincing Stery is the miserable example of the Landgrave of *Turing* (related not by *Heistibachius*, but *Heisterbachius*) who being admonished of his vitious conversation, and dangerous condition, made his Friends this Answer, *Si prædestinatus, nulla peccata, poterint mihi Regnum Cælorum auferre; si præscitus nulla opera mihi illud valebunt conferre.*

A man would almost think that this prophane Land-grave was a piece of an Arminian, because he opposeth *prædestinatus & præscitus*; whereas the Calvinists take Predestination in its latitude, and make Election and Reprobation to be contained under it. But however, this I am sure of, that a Monk in St. *Austin*'s time, being reproved by his Friends for his wickedness, answered, Whatsoever I am now, I shall be such as God foreseeth I will be. Shall we deny God's Prescience, because a wretched Monk abused it? no more must we deny Predestination, because the Land-grave of *Turing* did turn it into wantonness and lasciviousness. Had either Supralapsarian, or Sublapsarian, been present when the Land-grave uttered these words, it would have been answered, That though he were Predestinated, yet should he never be saved if he continued in his sins; and that though he were Reprobate, yet he should not miss of Heaven, if he continued by patience in well doing to seek for it. Salvation and Damnation are alway (if we speak of the adult) *secundum bona, & mala opera.*

Tiberius confuted himself, for though he pretended a full persuasion of a Mathematical fate or destiny, yet, as the same

Historian

Historian observeth, He was out of measure afraid of Thunders; and when the Air was cloudy, he always did wear on his head a Crown of Laurel. We may pity his ignorance, in thinking that there was any virtue in the Laurel to keep him from Thunder; but cannot choose but detest his Hypocrisie, who in words maintained a Fate, and yet endeavored to secure his life by as many means as were used by them that held no Fate. As much is their Hypocrisie to be abhorred, who take occasion from the irreversibleness of God's Decrees to neglect their Souls; and yet the irreversibleness of those Decrees notwithstanding, mind their Bodies as much or more then any persons in the World besides.

To conclude; Would it not exasperate? I could instance in those, who whilst they were prophane, were Arminians to the full; but left their Arminianism as they left their loosness; their own experience in conversion convincing them, that Faith was the gift of God in another way then the Arminians ever thought of. He that questioneth this, may be in part satisfied by reading the History of the Life and Death of the executed Bishop, published by Dr. *Bernard*. To my grief I observe, that there are multitudes of stupid and prophane wretches in the World; with some of them I have occasion to converse, and I find, that one main thing which keepeth them in their carnality, is a perswasion that there is an universal grace offered and tendered to all, by which they may repent and believe when they will; they therefore resolve, they will enjoy the pleasures of sin a little longer, and then they will receive and entertain the grace of God; and so get to Heaven as sure as the strictest and earliest Puritans.

Yea, this was the refuge and κηποφύλακτον of that grand Propagator of Arminianism Mr. *Thomson*; if any one in a fit of intemperance, minded him of the wrath of God threatned against such courses, he would answer, *I am a Child of the Devil to day; but I have Free-will, and to morrow I will make my self a Child of God.*

So I come to the fifth Chapter of the Historian, in which we have some account given of the Remonstrants; unto whom it will be found, that he hath discovered too much charity, though he could find in his heart to shew none at all to the Contraremonstrants.

His first Proposition is this, That the Remonstrants Opinion

though

though accused of Novelty, is Ancienter then Calvinism in the Churches of the Belgick *Provinces; which being originally Dutch, did first embrace Religion according to the Lutheran model, though afterwards they suffered the Calvinian platform to prevail upon them.*

A Proposition, concerning which he hath reason to pray, that it may meet with very easie and credulous Readers, else he may well expect it will be queried, 1. How it appears that the Lutheran and Calvinian model were then, as to the points of Grace and the Decrees, any way opposite? 2. How it can be proved, that on supposition the Lutheran and Calvinian platform were distinct, the *Belgick* Churches did first embrace Religion according to the the Lutheran, and not the Calvinian platform? To which second Question, it will in no wise be a satisfactory Answer to reply, That *Hardingbergius*, *Clemens*, *Martini*, *Hemicus Antonides*, had opinions about Predestination differing from Mr. *Calvin*; for granting this, yea, and granting further, that they had been through-paced Remonstrants, it need not be yielded, that the *Belgick* Churches were Lutheran; for there might be at the same time men every way as famous, and as likely to draw Disciples after them, that were Calvinistical. It is a truth known to all, that are not altogether unacquainted with the Stories of the Low Countries, that though in the first dawning of Reformation, the Preachers were not all of a mind; yet as things grew to a settlement, the Pelagian Leaven was purged out, a Confession of Faith published, (which was afterwards called *Belgica Confessio*) in which the Doctrine of Predestination is so explained, as Mr. *Calvin* explained it at *Geneva*; this was in the year 1566, or 1567.

Object. This Confession was ratified in a forcible and tumultuous way.

Answ. 1. This is said, and not proved out of any Record. 2. There is usually something of disorder cleaving to the best things that are done in dissetled times. 3. *Anno Christi* 1571. there was a full Synod at *Embden* (the Town extolled by the Doctor) in which it was ordained, That none should be admitted for a Minister, till he had been examin'd, and subscribed this Confession, and the Catechism of *Heidelberg*; which Decree was confirmed in the ensuing Synods of 1576, and 1586. and approved of by the States of *Holland*. Yet not

not so practised, but that in the want of others more Orthodox, there crept in some that taught things contrary both to the Confession and Catechism, whose hard names I will not fill my papers with; these men had not, notwithstanding all their restless endeavors, any great success, all things were reasonable quiet till *Arminius* came to be Divinity Professor at *Leyden*, which was *Anno* 1603. concerning which *Arminius* or *Van Harmine*, we must give a short account. He was at first a Tapster, or Chamberlain in a common Inn, from whence by the care of some Guests (who were pleased even to admiration with his prompt wit) he was removed, and set to School, maintained there out of the Publick Treasury of *Amsterdam*; where in process of time he was by the Magistrates of the City made Pastor, and preached with that accurateness and solidity, that every one thought him for his parts meet to be a Professor. Indeed *magnus esse potuit, si minor esse voluit:* he might have been high enough, had he not thought meet to raise himself higher, by trampling upon those whom the Churches of Christ have most deservedly had in the greatest admiration. The learned *Junius* being dead, *Vtengobard* thought none so meet to succeed him as *Van Harmaine*; but the *Belgick* Churches knew him too well to let him easily come to such a place, in which he might influence all that were candidates for the Ministry. The Deputies of the Churchs did admonish *Vtengobard*, that he would cease to commend a man *so suspected*, to the Curators of the University of *Leyden:* but he, too proud to regard such admonitions, desisted not to commend *Arminius*, till he had brought him into *Junius*'s Chair. But first a dismission must be obtained from *Amsterdam*, which could not easily be got, the Inhabitants of the City being taken with his Eloquence, the Presbytery (at least the wiser part of them) thinking that he did far less hurt at *Amsterdam* then he would do at *Leyden*, a place where Youth was formed, and where there was more liberty of teaching and prophecying then in a particular Church. However, dismissed he was at last, but upon this condition, that he should first have a Conference with the Learned *Gomarus*, and in that Conference, by a most free and open declaration of his Opinion, free himself from all suspition of Heterodoxy; and that he should promise, if he had any singular Opinions, he would not discover them to

the

the disturbarbance of the Churches. *Arminius*, if we may judge of his mind by what he writes to *Utengobard*, was not unwilling to come to this Conference; for these are his words from *Amsterdam* to *Utengobard*, 4. *Martii*, 1603. *Non vereor in* Arnoldi, Helmichii, Gomari, *& quorumcunque aliorum, qui istarum rerum peritissimi habentur, conspectu & praesentia de illis disserere, probe mihi conscius de sententia mea veritate, & illorum censuram minime reformidans, quod tibi idcirco dico ne hoc ipse timidius urgeas. Hasi quidem aliquando circa nonnullos articulos, non eousque tamen, ut quae de illis creditu necessaria ex Scripturis probari possunt, non adprobaverim, sed jam per diuturnas & assiduas meditationes id consecutus mihi videor, ut de omnibus & singulis rationem reddere non extimescam.* Accordingly a Conference there was before the Curators of the University, and the Deputies of the Synod; in which *Arminius* most expresly denied and condemned the Opinions of the *Pelagians*, concerning *Grace*, *Free-will*, *Original Sin*, *Perfection in this Life*, *Predestination*; adding, that he approved all that *Augustin*, and other Fathers had written against *Pelagius*; promising also to read nothing dissonant to the received Doctrine. Hereupon he was admitted Professor; and for some time he defended the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches in the Points of *Christ's Satisfaction*, *Justifying Faith*, *Justification by Faith*, *Perseverance in Faith*, *Certainty of Salvation*, and such other matters as afterwards he denied, and which he then (as is acknowledged by his good Friend *Corvinus*) maintained against his conscience. He seems by all his carriage, to be one that was resolved not to venture any further into the sea, then that he might have opportunity to step when he pleased upon the shore: Would *Barnevelt* have publickly undertaken his Patronage, then he would have ventured to proclaim defiance to all Dissenters; but *Barnevelt* not daring so to do, the valiant Professor contented himself mostly to instil his Notions and Principles into some of his Confidents, magnifying *Castali*, *Cornbertius*, *Suarezius*, and as much vilifying *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Martyr*, *Zanchy*, *Ursin*; yet when he was accused so to do, he peremptorily denieth himself to be in the least guilty of discommending *Calvin*, or commending *Cornebert*; as may be seen in his Epistle to *Sebastian Egbert*, bearing date *May* 3. 1607. *p.* 236. which is the usual way and method of Hereticks, he expressed him-

himself in such terms, as would serve to insinuate his own private Heterodox Opinions; and yet if he were questioned for them, he knew how to reconcile them to the Confessions and Catechism; contrary to which he pretends in a Letter to *Utengobard*, that he never did say any thing in publick.

He dreaded a Synod as the shadow of death; and thereupon set himself to make the Authority of the Magistrate in Ecclesiastical affairs to be all in all: and when he saw that all his Policy notwithstanding, a Synod was like to be called, and he in that Synod like to be made answer for himself, seized upon with sorrow, and overwhelmed with grief, he fell sick and died, *Anno* 1609. *Octob.* 19.

Two things more I would have observed concerning *Arminius*: 1. That in the set Conference betwixt him and *Gomarus*, not long before his death, he declared, that he had *never opposed the Doctrine of the certain Perseverance of Saints; and that he would not then oppose it, because such testimonies might be brought for it out of the Scriptures, as he was not able to answer; he would therefore only propound such places as made him somewhat to scruple and doubt about that matter.*

2. He would not then consent to have *Adolphus Venator* dismissed, and to take another Pastor in his place; though *Venator* was at that time, as well for the impurity of his life as his Doctrine, under the just censure of the Church: If the Remonstrants count it any way for their honour to fight under such a Captain or Leader, let them enjoy their phantasie; had not our first Reformers been endued with more courage and resolution, Religion had never made that progress among us that now it hath. I'le never think any Opinion worth embracing, whose Auther either doubts of it, or durst not suffer for it. However, glad I should be if they who follow, or rather out-run *Arminius* in the five Points, would be of the same mind with him as to the Pope of *Rome*; of whom he thus writes in an Epistle to *Sebastian Egbert*, bearing date *Septemb.* 24. 1608. *Aperte profiteor me Pontificem Romanum pro membro corporis Christi non habere; sed pro hoste, pro perduelle, pro sacrilego, pro blasphemo, pro tyranno, & violentissimo injustissimæ in Ecclesiam dominationis usurpatore, pro homine peccati, pro filio perditionis, pro exlege illo celeberrimo.*

Well had it been for the *Belgick* Churches, if Arminianism and *Arminius* had both died together; but they did not; breaches,

breaches, as the Doctor truly notes *page* 49. *grew wider and wider*: The Remonstrants, having no hopes their cause should succeed, if debated in a full and lawful Synod, endeavour to shelter themselves under the wing of the Civil Magistrate; whose favor that they might be the more sure to gain, they ceased not upon all occasions to imbitter the Civil Powers against all the Pastors that were of a persuasion contrary to theirs; *Speaking and Printing of them, as if they were Enemies to Magistracy, and introduced an Ecclesiastical Power collateral and equal to the Civil*: (an Artifice that Hereticks have alway used when they have been put to their shifts.) Not content thus to reproach their Brethrên, they further propound, if there must needs be a Synod, it might consist not *of Persons delegated by the Churches, but of certain nominated by the Magistrate*: Thinking that by this device they had put themselves out of all fear of Synodical censure, they make an open Schism, and present a Remonstrance to the States of *Holland* and *West-Friesland*; *in which they neither nakedly and simply declared their own Opinions, nor candidly represented the Tenents of their Adversaries.* Much they endeavered that no Copy of this Remonstrance might be given out; but at length a Copy was got, and a Contraremonstrance made. The Doctor tells us, that the *Remonstrants gained exceedingly upon their Adversaries; for the whole Controversie being reduced to these four Points; the Method and Order of Predestination; the Efficacy of Christ's Death; the Operations of Grace, both before and after Conversion; and Perseverance in the same; the Parties were admitted to a publick Conference at the* Hague, *Anno* 1611. *in which the Remonstrants were conceived to have much the better of the day*, pag. 49, 50.

But if a man may be so bold, Who were they that conceived the Remonstrants had much the better of the day? The Remonstrants themselves? *proprio laus sordet in ore.* The Contraremonstrants? they never so conceived, but rather reported themselves Victors. When were the Differences reduced to five Heads? not before the *Hague* Conference, I am sure; for the Deputies of the Churches charged the Followers of *Arminius*, with the Heterodoxies, in more Points then the five now mentioned, as appears by all the complaints exhibited against them: And there fell out something, which might justly give the World occasion to think, that the Remon-

monstrants were leavened with Socinianism, as well as with Pelagianism. For care being taken to choose one who might succeed *Arminius* in his Professors place, the Remonstrants thought none so meet as *Vorstius*, a man strongly suspected to be a great favorer of *Socinus*; and who had then newly Printed a Book, in the which he ascribed unto God, *Quantity*, *Composition*, *Mutability*, *Passive Power*, *and such other imperfections*, *as are altogether repugnant to his perfect Essence*: Yet at the Conference, the Remonstrants professed unanimously, that they had found nothing in the Writings of *Vorstius*, contrary either to Truth or Piety. At the Conference also the Contraremonstrants urged, that there were more things controverted betwixt them and the Remonstrants, than were contained in the five Articles.

I shall make a few Annotations on the five Articles of the Remonstrants.

1. *That Almighty God ordained to save all those in Christ, for Christ, through Christ, who being fain, and under the command of sin, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, do persevere in Faith and Obedience to the very end.*

This Article is such, as no Christian would deny; yet the Remonstrants do lay down such Assertions, as do by most necessary consequence quite overthrow this Decree: For *Poppius*, a man of note and renown among them, seems much to doubt, Whether a late, though never so serious Repentance, do avail a man to Salvation; nay, he expressly affirms, *in praxi Consolationis ægrotantium*, that he is destitute of any Promise so universal, as that by it any one who dies with but a deathbed serious Repentance, can be assured that he shall go to Heaven; and that it is uncertain whether such late serious Penitents, go with the Thief into Paradise, or with those that die in their Sins to Hell. Nor is this the singular opinion of *Poppius*, I can shew the same in *Episcopius*; not to mention some of our own here in *England*. The Sublapsarians make the object of Reprobation, man fallen into Sin; the Remonstrants say, that man recovered out of Sin by true Repentance, may be the object of Reprobation and Damnation. How easily might I, if I took pleasure in recriminations, tell them of ascribing Tyranny, Hypocrisie, Respect of Persons unto God; but I only desire my Reader to consider, whether the Remonstrant do not Preach another

Gospel,

Gospel, then what hath been hitherto taught in the Church of Christ; nothing was thought more undoubted, than that he who believes shall be saved: The Remonstrant faith, this is not necessarily true; and that thousands and millions of true Believers may go to Hell. How will such as these deal with an Unbeliever that is but twenty years old? will they persuade him to believe Christ? He will ask them, what encouragement they can give him to believe? Will they reply, Salvation is promised to Believers in Christ? He will rejoyn; Can you give me any Promise, that I shall live long enough to shew forth my Faith by my Works? if you cannot, there's but small encouragement to believe; for to a late, though serious Believer, you say there is no certain promise of Salvation. But let us leave the Remonstrants to reconcile themselves to their own Decree; and take notice, that at the Conference the Remonstrants were further asked, Whether they made this Article to contain the whole and entire Decree of Predestination? 2. Whether they made Faith, and perseverance in Faith, causes or conditions which did antecede Election unto Salvation, or fruits which grow out of Election, and so follow it, after some tergiversation? They said, That they acknowledged no other Predestination, then that which they had in their first Article expressed. 2. That Faith did, in the consideration of God, precede Election to Salvation, and was not a fruit of it. This is their opinion about the Decree; which now that it is opened, appears to be as repugnant to Scripture, as before when it was wrapped up it seemed agreeable: Were this Opinion true, it should not be said, that we are elected that we may be holy, but because we were holy; nor would the Holy Ghost have said, as many as were ordained to eternal life believed; but, as many as believed were ordained to eternal life.

The second Article, as translated by the Doctor, page 50. is, *That Jesus Christ suffered death for all men, and in every man; that by his death upon the Cross, he might obtain for all mankind forgiveness of sins, &c. with this condition notwithstanding, that none but true Believers should enjoy the benefit of the reconciliation, and forgiveness of sins.*

I have, if I forget not, in the Pamphlets of some Quakers, read this phrase of Christ's suffering death in every man, and looked upon it as non-sense, so I do still; and therefore will

hope it never dropped from the Doctor's Pen, but is to be put among the Errata's of the Printer. As to the Article itself, I can easily grant it to be *a truth* (though all Contra-remonstrants do not) but it is *not all the truth*; Christ died not with an intent only to make man reconcileable and salvable, but also to purchase for some, whom the Scriptures call Elect, the very graces of Faith and Repentance: Here therefore is the Question betwixt us, Whether Christ died with the same intention for all? Remonstrants affirm, Contra-remonstrants deny, Christ hath procured, that whoever comes to the Father through him, shall be saved; but there are also some, for whom he hath procured that they shall come to the Father.

The third and fourth Articles are so worded, as to contain nothing but the truth (though not all the truth) save that in the end of the fourth is said, *That as for the manner of the co-operation of Grace; it is not to be thought irresistible, in regard that it is said of many in the holy Scriptures, that they did resist the Holy Ghost, Acts 7. and in other places*; which is a very rude Assertion, either impertinent or false. If the meaning be, that some operations of the Holy Spirit are resisted, some of his motions quenched, Who ever denied this? If the meaning be, that the converting work of the Spirit may be resisted in some degree and measure, that will not be gainsaid either: But this we say, *That converting Grace doth determine the Will; that Grace effectual, doth not leave the Will at liberty, utterly to resistire, or not; but taketh away that which maketh resist or make head against the Spirit.*

As for the fifth Article, it seems they did not know their own minds, they profess *That such as are ingrafted into Christ by a lively Faith, may be Conquerors; Christ is ready to assist them, if for their parts they prepare themselves to the encounter, and beseech his help, and are not wanting to themselves in performing duties: But they say, it is first to be well weighed and approved by the holy Scripture, whether they may not by their own negligence, forsake those Principles of saving Grace, by which they are sustained in Christ, before they can publickly teach these Doctrines with any sufficient tranquility or assurance of mind.*

All which is no more then may be said of that fundamental Doctrine concerning the Trinity; for it must first be well weighed, whether the Scriptures do hold forth a Trinity of

Persons,

Persons; before a man ventures publickly to Preach that Mystery. I think that if we search the Scriptures, it will soon be found, that though the Regenerate may lose the Spirit of God, and would soon lose him if they were left to themselves, yet there is a promise by which God hath engaged himself, not to let sin so far prevail in them as quite to extinguish the Spirit, totally to destroy the new Creature and workmanship of God.

One would think that the Remonstrants, who thus poorly sought to hide their Opinions, should not have much reason to brag of the success of the Conference; yet Dr. *Heylin* is resolved to tell us, that the Contraremonstrants had the worst, *page 54. and that finding themselves not to have thrived much better by their Pen-combats, then in that of the Tongue, they betook themselves to other courses, vexing and molesting their Opposites in their Classes or Consistories, endeavouring to procure them from Preaching in their rural Churches, or otherwise to bring them to Publick Censure.*

It would better have beseemed the Doctor to have answered Dr. *Ames* his *Coronis ad Collatiorem Hagiensem*, then thus to have boasted of an imaginary success; especially seeing the States ordered to leave these Articles just in the same state that they were in before the Conference. After this Conference, I find the States enjoyning both parties to give in their judgements, what they thought the best way for the composing of the Controversies that were in the Church, which did much endanger the Peace of the Commonwealth. The Remonstrants, in order to accommodation, propounded, *That there might be a Toleration, both Parties being permitted freely to Teach and Publish their Opinion.* The Contraremonstrants judged the best way for the composing of the Differences was this, That a *National Synod* should be called, in which it might be determined which Opinion was most agreeable to Scripture, and to the common judgement of the Reformed Churches. These two ways being propounded to the States, they were divided in their Opinions; and so nothing could be determined; only they enjoyned, in order to the crushing of the *Vorstian* Party, that none should teach otherwise concerning *Christ's Satisfaction for our Sins, the Justification of Men before God, Saving Faith, Original Sin, Certainty of Salvation*, then had been taught in other Reformed

Churches, and in those Provinces. If ever men forsook the Word, and betook themselves to the Sword, the Remonstrants did. *Adolphus Venator*, when Magistrates were chosen that favored not his Opinion, stirred up the common Rabble against them; nor would this Rabble rest, till their Magistrates had been thrown out of their places, and others put into them; who had no sooner got the Government of the City into their hands, then they proceeded, by the instigation of *Venator*, to lay by the Elders and Deacons, and to deprive the two Pastors, *Petrus Cornelii* and *Cornelius Hellenius*, of their places: The like was done by the procurement of that Superficiary Creature *Grevinchovius* to *Cornelius Gesilius*. What should I speak of the Persecutions raised by the Remonstrants against all those that (not knowing how to joyn in communion with them) did only go to some Orthodox Minister, that would feed them with Bread, and not Poison? The banishing, or incarceration of so many Contraremonstrants, shews that the Remonstrants would not grant that Toleration unto others, which they so earnestly desired for themselves. But at last King *James*, and the Prince of *Orange*, prevailed so far upon the States, that a National Synod was like to be called. What do the Remonstrants now? why they go about to perswade some States-men, that a National Synod was contrary to the Liberty of the Provinces; for every Province had a Power, a supream independent Power to determine concerning Religion, as was by the Rulers of the Province judged most convenient; that this Power was to be maintained even to the taking up of Arms, and the Hazard of their Lives. These Seditious Speeches did so work upon some Governors of Cities, that making a conspiracy, they decreed to raise Soldiers, that should be neither under the States General, nor the Prince of *Orange*. In how many places this was done, it matters not to relate; but by this means such a Civil war had been raised, as would have had worse consequents then ever had all the Wars with the King of *Spain*, had not the States General required the Prince of *Orange* to imprison *the Heads of this Conspiracy*, viz. *Barnevelt*, *Hugerbetius*, *Grotius*, *Ledenbergius*, *to disband these new Soldiers*, *to purge the Cities of disaffected Magistrates*, *and to substitute better in their rooms*; all which the Prince with incredible courage and speed effected, and that without the effusion

effusion of the least drop of bloud; so at length *per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum.*

A Synod is called, and did assemble at *Dort*, 1618. this Assembly is sufficiently reproached by the Doctor, whilst it is for some Pages compared with the Council of *Trent*, the worst meeting that ever pretended to assemble in the name and fear of God: Yet may not the Assembly think much to be thus maligned, when he is so hardy as to *affirm*, *that the States General put* Barnevelt *to death contrary to the fundamental Laws of the Country, and the Rules of the Union*, p. 55. Had he been pleased to name what fundamental Law this execution of *Barnevelt* was contrary to, we might then have been in some capacity to examine the truth of so high and deep a charge; but sith he hath not descended to particularize wherein the contrariety did consist, we must look on the charge as a calumny, so much the more improbable, because one of *Barnevelt*'s Confederates, *viz. Ledenberg*, was after his condemnation surprized with so much horror of Conscience, that he turned his own Executioner; concerning which let me have leave to say, I have but seldom observed, that true Christian Patriots have been given up to self-murder, unlest in some fit of frenzy or deep melancholy, which I do not find the best Friends of *Ledenberg* alleadge on his behalf. *Barnevelt* died more manfully, acquainting those who were present at his Execution, how faithfully he had served his Country. I much wonder what was the source of his zeal for the Remonstrants, doubtless it was not any love to their Opinions; for in the continuation of the incomparable *Thuanus*, *ad annum* 1618. we have his Apology to the States of *Holland* and *West-Friesland*, in which he tells us what his Opinion was then, being 71. years old; and what was his Opinion whilst he resided at *Heidelberg*; and this Opinion was such as methinks should not please the Arminians, I am sure it is a note above my *ela*, *viz.* "That every good Christian must believe "that he is by the grace of God, and satisfaction of our "Lord and Redeemer Christ Jesus, predestinated to Sal-"vation; that by the same grace of God he had received "Faith, by which he firmly believes that his Salvation hath "not any other foundation then the grace of God, and merits "of our Lord Jesus Christ; if it happen that he fall into "grievous sins, he must firmly lean on this confidence, that

"God will not permit that he should persevere in sins; and "that it will come to pass, that if he ask pardon, God would "convert him through his mercy, call him to repentance, and "make him persevere in faith to the end. He adds, that he had "shewed this his Opinion to sundry Divines, and even to *Ole-*"*vian* himself; by whom he was told, that he might acquiess "in that Doctrine, and that there was no need he should "search deeper in the secrets of this mystery. Again, speak-"ing of Remonstrants and Contraremonstrants, he saith, "That he did not more incline to one Opinion then another. So that we may think that he had only some Political design to drive on; what it was, and how much it failed him, I will not say; but go on to see, whether the parallel do hold good betwixt the Councel of *Trent*, and the Synod of *Dort*.

1. Page 55. *Neither of them was concerned to confute, but condemn their Opposites.*

What shall be done to thee thou aspersing Pen? did not the Synod of *Dort* count themselves concerned to confute their Adversaries? let all the English Arminians, laying their heads together, name me that part of just liberty that was denied to the Remonstrants; it was not only allowed, but also enjoyned them, by all the Power Civil and Ecclesiastical, to lay down their Opinion concerning Predestination and Reprobation, together with their Reasons: But the Politick Disputants say, they would begin at Reprobation, or do nothing at all; they peremptorily refused to set down their own Tenents, and to confirm them; and will needs make themselves Opponents, and put the Synod to Answer Cavils scraped up out of the Writings of Men dead, or not there to answer for themselves: If they may not have a liberty to propound, explain, and defend their cause in that very way they judge best; they will not lay down their opinions. Must the Synod be thought not to account it self concerned to confute Adversaries, because men cited and summoned to appear, are not permitted to give and prescribe Laws to those whom in Reason they are bound to Obey? The Doctrine of the Remonstrants is confuted in the Canons of the Synod of *Dort*, by plain Texts of Scripture, or by convincing Reasons, and common experience. Their *Synodalia* are refelled abundantly by *Ames*, by *Wallæus*, *Twiss*, &c.

D. H.

D. H. page 5.

2. *The Council of* Trent *consisted for the most part of Italian Bishops, some others being added for fashion sake, and that it might the better challenge the name of General; as that of* Dort, *consisted for the most part of the Delegates of the* Belgick *Churches, to whom the foreign Divines were found inconsiderable.*

What a wilde parallel is this? Is it equally faulty for a National Synod to consist mostly of the Delegates of the *Belgick* Churches, and for a Councel pretending to be Oecumenical, to consist mostly of Italian Bishops, and those many of them but titular? far better, and with more colour of reason it might be objected against our Synods, or Convocations here in *England*, that they consist not mostly, but only of English Divines, not one Foreigner being admitted either to consult or to decide; nor the Puritan Non-conformists so much as invited to declare their Opinions, or to alleadge any thing in their own Justification. Who ever till now found in any History, a National Synod branded and censured, because as many Foreigners were not admitted to it, as there were of that very Nation for whose sake the Synod was assembled.

D. H. Ibid.

The Differences as great at Dort *as they were at* Trent, *and as much care taken to addulce the discontented Parties in the one, as the other.*

In this also the Parallel is unparallel: Differences there were at the Councel of *Trent* about the very fundamentals of Faith; but the Differences at *Dort* were very sleight and inconsiderable, lying in the way and manner of expressing and wording the Doctrine, rather then in the Doctrine it self, as will appear by examining particulars.

1. 'Tis said *pag.* 55, 56. *That the British Divines, together with one of those that came from* Breme; *maintained the Universal Redemption of mankind by the Death of Christ; but this by no means would be granted by the rest of the Synod.*

Concerning this matter of Universal Redemption, it is noted in Dr. *Balcanquil*'s Letters, *page* 1. *That as there was difference*

difference touching it in the Synod, so there was much difference about it in their own (i. e. the English) College: The Question among them was, Whether the words of Scripture, which are likewise the words of our Confession, Christus oblatus est, aut mortuus pro toto humano genere, seu pro peccatis totius mundi, *be to be understood of all particular men, or only of the Elect, who consist of all sorts of men.* Dr. Davenant *and* Dr. Ward (*saith the Letter*) *are of* Martinius *of* Breme's *mind, that it is to be understood of all particular men; the other three take the other exposition, which is of the Writers of the Reformed Churches; and namely of my late Lord of Canterbury: both sides think they are right, and therefore cannot yield one unto another with a safe Conscience.* Yet *page* 4. *S. D. C.* Lord Ambassador, *is desired to acquaint* (if he thought fit) *His Grace of* Canterbury, *that this matter is like to be a difference, not in the English College, but in the Synod.* How well this may be accorded with the former Letter, is not for me to judge. Page 8. *'Tis said that some of the Provincials did use* Martinius *very uncivilly, he is a man very learned and honest, sound in all the five Articles as any man in the Synod, except the second; in which when the Canons come to be made, your Lordship will hear there will be more of his Opinion besides himself.* Page 25. Dr. *Balcan.* gives us a relation of the *Judgements of the British Divines and others, concerning the second Article; the* Bremenses *are affirmed, according to the number of their Persons, to have delivered three several judgements:* Martinius *his judgement was first read, who did stand in effect to the Tenents of the Remonstrants in the second Article, he mainly overthrew the recieved distinction and restriction, and did determine that Christ did truly die for all and every man; that he was made a propitiation both for the godly and the wicked; and that by his death he did impetrate reconciliation with God for them all: at the latter end he condemned many things both in the Remonstrants and in the Contraremonstrants Opinion, but more in the Contraremonstrants.* Isselburgius *defended both the recieved distinction and restriction.* Crocius *propounded a middle way between his two Colleagues, granting (which we also in our College did) that Christ by his death did merit some supernatural things for the wicked, but nothing belonging to remission of sin, or reconciliation with God; and so indeed, for any thing I could perceive, his judgement was directly against that of* Martinius, *and in effect all one with*

that

thus of Isselburgius. Finally, we are told *page 26. that in the second Article there was not altogether so uniform a consent, both in regard of phrases and forms of speaking, and in regard of some Propositions, as were in the first; yet certainly there was very great, more than could be expected from so great a number of learned men in so hard and controverted an Article.* So that whereas Dr. *Heylin* counts it a reproach to the Synod, that there was so much difference about universal Redemption, Dr. *Bekaw* thinks it an honour there was no more. But not to leave this matter so much in the dark, if *Martinius* was for the Arminian equal indifferent, universal Redemption of every one of mankind, I am well assured, that neither all the British Divines, nor any one of them was of his mind: but indeed his Opinion and the Remonstrants Opinion, seem to be heavenly wide, as may be proved from his subscriptions to the Synodal Determinations about the Death of Christ, and mans Redemption by that Death, *Acta Synodi pag.* 356. for no man can think, that in those Determinations, the Opinion of the Remonstrants was not condemned: But if this be not thought proof sufficient, let the Reader be pleased to turn to *Acta Synodi pag.* 639, &c. where the judgement of this *Martinius* is fully recorded: In the very entrance he professeth to follow *Ambrose, Si Christus pro omnibus mortuus est, specialiter tamen pro nobis passus est. Pag.* 643, 644. he rejects seventeen Errors, the far greater part of which are the Tenents of the Remonstrants. As for *Ludovicus Crocius*, he hath in his *Duodecas Dissertationum* (provoked thereunto by the cavils of some) taken a great deal of pains to state this Question about the universality of Christ's Redemption; in the tenth dissertation he explaineth the terms, and rejecteth the extream Opinions; in the eleventh he delivereth his own Opinion in no fewer then nineteen Conclusions; in any of which, if the Remonstrants can find any lettice for their lips, much good may it do them. For my part I wonder that Dr. *Bekanquil* should here write, *that for any thing he could perceive, the judgement of* Crocius *was directly contrary to that of* Martinius. The judgements of both those Learned men are recorded about the second Article, and there is not the least contrariety betwixt them; both hold universal Redemption in the sense laid down by Dr. *Davenant*, in his most excellent Dissertation *de morte Christi*: Neither of them maintain

it

be in any other sense; both of them heartily agreed and subscribed to the Canons of the Synod of *Dort* made in the second Article, as did also our British Divines; who yet had received it in charge from King *James*, not to deny that Christ died for all and every man. Moreover, it is most manifest, that *Crocius* did in the Synod maintain the universality of Christ's death, by a Letter written to him from one of his Colleagues from *Bremo*, during the Session of the Synod *Anno* 1619. *Feb.* 25. for in that Letter, *he hath thanks given him for maintaining the universality of Christ's death; and it told, that his Opinion was approved by all to whom he had shewn it.* Vide *Crocii Differ. secunda de Peccato Originis*, pag. 61, 62.

D. H. page 56.

"The general Body of the Synod not being able to avoid "the inconveniences which the Supralapsarian way brought "with it, were generally intent on the Sublapsarian way; "but on the other side, the Commissioners of the Churches "of South-*Holland* thought it not necessary to determine "which were considered, man *salve* or not *salve*; while he "passed the Decrees of Election and Reprobation; (*Gomarus* "more positivo was *Gomarus*, who stood as strongly to the "absolute, irrespective and irreversible Decree (exclusive of "mans sin, and our Saviour's sufferings) as he could have "done for the holy Trinity, and delivered his own judgement "in writing apart by it self.

Thus our Historian: But what saith Dr. *Belcan.* page 25. *So ended the reading of the judgements of all Colledges concerning the first Article, in which, praised be God for it, there was not the least suspition of dissention of any thing; and it is to be noted, that all of them determined* homo lapsus *to be the subject of Predestination; except* Gomarus, *whom all men know to be against it, and the South-*Hollandi, *who only said, they would determine nothing of it.* One Doctor upbraids the Synod with Dissention, another praises God (as there was reason) for their Unity: Indeed if the difference betwixt Supra and Sublapsarians be calmly considered, it will be found to be only in *Apice Logico* (as Dr. *Twiss* speaks;) and to determine of Logical Niceties, is not work proper for a Synod of Divines met together to settle the Peace of the Churches. I believe the

Divines'

Divines Assembled in this present Convocation; have as considerable differences among themselves about the Doctrine of the Trinity, as this comes to; nor is it to be expected that we should agree in *minutiis Logicis aut Metaphysicis*, any more then that we should be all of the same stature or complexion, as to the outward man. Mr. *Hord*, so much made use of by our Quinquarticular Historian, plainly confesseth, *There is no reason that the Supra and Sublapsarians should differ about circumstances, since they agree in the substance.* *Junius* thought the three Opinions about the object of Predestination were rather *seemingly* then *really* opposite. *Piscator* will not grant that they are opposite, but only different; and therefore that all three may have place, he resolves the whole matter of Predestination into three Acts: The first is, *The Decree of creating men to different ends*; this must needs have for its object *massam nondum conditam.* The second Act is, *The Decree of permitting Sin*; and this must needs have for its object *man created, but not yet corrupted.* The third Act is, *The Decree of Electing and Reprobating*; and this must have for its object, *man both created and corrupted.* 'Tis besides my purpose to enquire, how much or how little is to be said against this way of reconciliation: but this I undertake to prove, that the distance betwixt the Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians is not so great, but that they both may and ought to look upon one another as Brethren, and walk in love, which is the bond of perfection, and fulfilling of the Law; the more pity is it that they should so bitterly inveigh against each other, as it cannot be dissembled that sometimes they do; but this must be imputed to the ἀνθρώπινα καὶ πρόσκαιρα, of which we shall have some degrees as long as we live in this World: But the Doctor, as if he were perfectly free from this crime, thus throweth his stones at others.

Page 56.

Nor were the Differences managed with such sobriety as became the gravity of the Persons, and weight of the business, but it broke out many times into such open heats and violences, as are not to be paralel'd in the like Assemblies; the Provincial Divines bauding against the Foreigners, and the Foreigners falling foul on one another.

For

For proof of this we are referred to the Letters of Mr. *Hales* and Dr. *Balcanquil*, from which it doth indeed appear, that some very unhandsome language was usid by *Gomarus* and *Lubbertus* against *Martinius*, and by *Bruhesius* against him and *Crocius*; but sure *Scultetus* was not Forteigner, but one Forteigner. *Gomarus* and *Lubbertus* were, though Learned men, yet constitutionally hot and cholerick, and therefore apt to break out into unseemly speeches against those who opposed them. Dr. *Balcanquil* saith, *he could no more blame them for being angry, than he could a stone for descending to its centre.* I more wonder that *Scultetus*, a man of a better temper, should so far forget himself; but he was transported through a misapprehension, that his reverend and dear Colleague was abused. I scarce account it Christian in Dr. *Heylin* to rake up, and bring to remembrance the passionate speeches of men, who have many years since given an account unto their Master, and never to mention the satisfaction they made to the men whom they had injured: For it is said, *page* 15. *that they protested they had no hard opinion of* Martinius *or* Crocius, *but accounted them Learned, Religious, Orthodoxal; were sorry for what they had done, and would do so no more.*

Page 64. we have an attempt to make another parallel betwixt the Council of *Trent* and Synod of *Dort*, the sum whereof is this: "That the Canons and Decrees of the Council of "*Trent* were so drawn up, as that both *Soto* the Dominican, "and *Vega* the Franciscan, did expound them all according "to their own Opinions; which yet did not only differ, but "also were expressly contrary: And so the Conclusions and "Results of the Synod of *Dort* were so drawn up for giving "satisfaction to the Sublapsarians, that those of the Su-"pralapsarian faction might pretend some title to them al-"so; in so much that there was a bitter contention betwixt "*Voetius* and *Maresius* about the sense of the Synod.

A comparison that halts not on one foot, but upon every foot; concerning which it is hard to say, whether it be more spiteful or ridiculous: The Opinions of the Franciscans and Dominicans differ far more, then do the Opinions of the Supra and Sublapsarians. Nor is it so material to determine, whether truth lie on the side of the Supralapsarian or Sublapsarian, as whether the Dominican or Franciscan be in the right. The parallel (a Fanatick would say) had run better if

if it had been thus drawn, as both Franciscan and Dominican lay claim to the Canons of the Council of *Trent*, so both Arminian and Antarminian lay claim to the seventeenth Article of the Church of *England*. The holy Scriptures themselves are not so penned, but that men of contrary persuasions do lay claim to them; upon which score yet none but a professed Papist, or Infidel, will accuse them of insufficiency, or obscurity: Particularly the Apostle makes use, *Rom.* 9. of the Greek word σύκαμινα, borrowed from the ancient Prophets; some say, that by it he intends the Mass corrupted; others say, the Mass uncorrupted: Some circumstances are picked up out of the Text and Context that do favour both Opinions. What then? must the divinely inspired Scriptures be condemned? God forbid.

Page 65. We have the old and several times confuted Calumny, of the Synods not giving the Remonstrants leave to speak for themselves before condemnation, renewed; and a Story concerning the hard measure meted out to the Delegates of the Province of *Utrecht*, which is the only thing that deserves to have any notice taken of it. Concerning these Deputies, I shall first observe what Mr. *Hales* saith of them in his Letters, *page* 29. and then relate the whole story concerning them; and so leave it to any one, but Dr. *Heylin*, to judge, whether they were hardly dealt with. *I marvel much that the Province of* Utrecht, *being the strength of the Remonstrants, could find no wiser men to handle their cause; for as they did very foolishly in betraying their private instructions, so in this whole alteration they did not speak one wise word*: So Mr. *Hales*. Matter of fact stands thus; A doubt was moved concerning the Deputies for the Remonstrants of *Utrecht*, Whether they were to be a part of the Synod, or in the number of the Remonstrants who were cited to appear before the Synod? The Reasons of the doubt were sundry; but the chief was, because in their credential Letters, they were charged to defend the cause of the Remonstrants: now it could not be, that they should be both Defendants and Judges in the same Cause. The answer to this was, that they were not so limitted, but that in their private instructions they had leave to do otherwise if they thought good. But when the private instructions were read, all that could be found was but this, that they had commission to defend their Cause, or to labour at least for

an

an accommodation, or toleration of it; but that they had power to pronounce decisively; that did not appear. Hereupon it was determined; that they could not be Members of the Synod in this Cause (for in any other they might) but only as *citati*. Yet notwithstanding, that they might see the equity of the Synod, it was permitted them to keep their places, on these conditions: 1. If they would quit their Defence of the Cause. 2. If they would give no Advise or Counsel, either directly or indirectly, to the *citati*; and by no means meddle with them in their Cause, &c. Not liking these Conditions, they declared that they resolved to leave their place of Judges, and to adjoyn themselves to the other Remonstrants; which they did. What in all this proceeding is unjust? what unworthy of a Synod?

Page 66. the Synod is charged with *being too favourable to the Supralapsarians, and particularly to* Maccovius, *who openly maintained, that God willed sin; that he ordained sin as sin; and that by no means he would have all men to be saved; that God doth propound his Word to Reprobates for no other end, then that they might be left without excuse*, &c. Yet was he only dismissed with a friendly admonition.

'Tis true, that some of these speeches, though not all, were charged on *Maccovius*: Nor could the Synod condemn them simply, unless they would also condemn St. *Austin*, who is known in his *Enchir. cap.* 29. to have delivered this maxime, *Non aliquid fit nisi omnipotens fieri velit, vel sinendo ut fiat, vel ipse faciendo.* Many Scripture-expressions of like import might be produced. But yet if *Maccovius* did use such expressions before persons not seen in these Controversies, he did ill, and was to be blamed; for all truths are not fit for all ears. Sufficient to the Synods vindication it is, that *Maccovius* was brought before the Synod upon a by occasion; and that the business betwixt him and *Lubbertus* was committed to the examination of some few Delegates, according to whose report he was dismissed.

But the Contraremonstrants are cruel and malicious. How so forsooth? *Because when the Synod had concluded in the condemnation of the Remonstrants Doctrine, they proceeded to the destruction of their Persons, calling upon them to subscribe to the Acts of the Synod, and setting them a peremptory day for conforming to it; and when they saw they would not do it, by their*

incensed

incensed importunity, they procured a Proclamation from the States General, to banish them from their native Country, with their Wives and Children, and so compelling them to beg their bread, even in desolate places, page 67.

A very lamentable story, that Remonstrants should be banished and their Wives and Children, and that they should be compelled to beg their bread, and their begging be confined to desolate places: But what were the names of these Remonstrants who were put to all this extremity? Where is this Proclamation of the States General recorded, that such an ignorant man as I am may come to the sight of it? Certainly whatever these Remonstrants had of Free-will, they had not much wisdom in them, or else they would never have made choice of desolate places to beg their bread in; places inhabited, and populous Cities, are the places that our English Beggars resort to. The Histories that I meet with relate of attempts and endeavors that were used in order to an accommodation; and the Contraremonstrants easily granted, that the simple meek Arminian might be continued and cherished in the bosome of the Church, provided that he would not disturb the peace of the Church: But the Remonstrants unhappily chusing *Episcopius* to write their *Confessio Fidei*, broached and vented so many Socinian Errors, that there was no possibility, without violating all rules of discipline, of taking them into Church-fellowship. That no severity was used against the Remonstrants presently upon the concluding of the Synod, I am not able to say; it is not unlike they might have a little of that measure meeted out to them, which they had meeted out unto others: But I am sure that *Curcellaus* himself acknowledgeth, that *Episcopius* an Arminian, and somewhat more then an Arminian, was not long after he was put out of his Professors place, suffered both at *Rotterdam* and *Amsterdam*, to enjoy a preferment honourable and gainful. Might the Non-conformists, who differ only in a point of Ceremony and Discipline, have so fair quarter from their Episcopal Brethren, as the Remonstrants had from the Contraremonstrants, they would not sure make such loud Complaints of Trouble and Persecution as now they do.

That the Remonstrants may be the more pitied, the Doctor acquaints us with an History of the *Netherlands*, written by one *Cross*, a Fellow of no parts or judgement, in which History

Will. Cross, Continuator of Grimston's Hist. of the Netherlands

it is affirmed, *that there was a Synod called at* Dort *to suppress the Arminians; and that the said Arminians held among other Heresies, 1. That God was the Author of Sin. 2. That he created the far greater part of mankind only of purpose to damn them, with several others of that kind; which every man of reason knows not only to be the consequence and results of* Calvin's *Doctrine, but to be positively maintained and taught by some of his Followers*, pag. 67, 68.

But first, What if some ignorant Writer, abused with a false report, did thus misrepresent the grounds of the Arminians condemnation, is this any other *cross* (to borrow one witticism from our Historian) then what hath befallen men as honest and famous as the Remonstrants? Was not our own Country-man *Wickliff*, who did write professedly against begging Friers, reported by his Adversaries to be a favorer of begging? If it could be proved, that the Contraremonstrants had set this Mr. *Cross* thus to traduce and calumniate the Remonstrants, it had been a foul crime in them; but that they did so, is not pretended. The whole blame therefore of this false report must be on our English Bishops, who would admit a Fellow of no Parts or Judgement into holy Orders, and licence his History; and on the Author himself, who would venture to write the History of things that he understood not. So what if this *Cross* was of the Remonstrants own making? It hath been usual for men, upon some accounts truly guilty, and deservedly blamed, to procure themselves to be accused of some other things that they were never guilty of, that so the World finding them abused in one point, might think them innocent in all. In the late Wars, I believe some Wags have framed stories against their own Party, and sent them up to *London* to be Printed, with no other design then this, to make the *Diurnalists* and *Intelligencers* ridiculous, and suspected even when they relate truth.

2. If this *Cross* is so much to be blamed for his malice, why doth Dr. *Heylin* imitate him, if not exceed him, in saying, *that every man of reason knows that these blasphemies are the consequence and result of* Calvin's *Doctrine?* Were all those eminent Professors, and learned Preachers, who in their Sermons and Lectures, and printed Treatises, have maintained, that it doth not from *Calvin*'s Doctrine follow, that God is the Author of Sin, men of no reason? or were they so base,

as to go about to maintain a thing against their knowledg; Certain I am, that they are not followers, but forsakers of *Calvin*, who positively maintain and teach, either that God is the Author of Sin, or that he created the far greater part of mankind only of purpose to damn them: That he again and again denied God to be the Author of Sin, no man will gainsay, that hath read either his *Institutions*, or his Answer to the *Calumnies of a Knave*, or his *Discourse against the Libertines*. As for creating men on purpose to damn them, let the Reader but observe what he saith for himself *de æterna Dei præsidentia*; *Etsi quid rei gentri humanæ futurum esse Deus ab initio decrevit, hac tamen loquendi ratio, usquam apud me occurrit, finem creationis esse æternum interitum.*

3. What if a man should say, that some at least of the Remonstrants are guilty of these Blasphemies? they make God to be the Author of Concupiscence, and Concupiscence is Sin; therefore they make God the Author of Sin. They also make God not to have decreed to any one that Grace, which alone can keep men out of Hell; therefore they make him to create mankind with an intention to damn the whole race. In the Calvinists method, some are sure to be saved; but in the way of the Arminians, no man can be saved; all being left to the liberty and indifferency of their own corrupt wills, which must necessarily ruine them at last.

I will not justifie Mr. *Cross* in what he relates concerning the Remonstrants; but I will say this, that I can manifestly prove, that sundry who pretend the greatest zeal against making God the Author of Sin, do themselves make him the Author of Sin, or say he may be the Author of Sin. It is not unknown that Socinians deny God's prescience of the free actions of men, *si omnia futura Deus præsciret, aperiebit omnium causas jam ante ab ipso ordinatas esse atque ita necessario efficerentur author peccatorum*, are the words of the *Compendium of Socinianism*, confuted by *Cloppenber. cap. 6.* When we urge against them that of *John 6. 64. He knew from the beginning who should betray him.* What answers *Volkelius*? *That the sin and punishment of Judas contained in them somewhat singular.* Well, allow them to have in them somewhat singular; yet this Proposition, *the sin of Judas was certainly foreknown*, must needs be true; if it were foreknown, then it was foredetermined; if foredetermined, then God was the cause of it.

I instance secondly in *Episcopius*, from whom I thus argue;

Christ may be the Author of Sin.
Christ is God: Ergo
God may be Author of Sin.

The major is most clearly laid down by *Episcopius*; and for many Pages together defended in his Answer to the acute *Camero*, *cap.* 13. yea, and he wonders that *Camero* should think he had any fear, when this so at least ill-sounding a Proposition was delivered by him: He alledgeth that some Schoolmen had said so before him, which may not be denied; but yet seeing *actus sunt suppositorum*, he will be as hard put to it, not to make God the Author of Sin, as any Calvinist.

I instance thirdly in Mr. *Th. Pierce*, from whom thus I argue:

God is the Cause of every Being,
Whether visible or invisible: Therefore
God is the Cause of Sin.

The antecedent is an Article of our Creed; the consequent is proved, because Mr. *Pierce* again and again asserts Sin to be positive. His beloved Author, Dr. *Jackson*, in his eighth Book of Commentaries, hopes to bring himself off from this argumentation by limiting the Proposition; *God made all things visible, and invisible to substances, which only are the immediate and direct effects and proper objects of creation. Accidents had their beginings as appurtenances to their subjects, by resultance only.* But I answer, that I suppose he is the first that ever said, that all accidents had their begining by resultance; and the first that so limited this maxime to substances: For though it may be granted, that both creation and generation, strictly so called, are terminated to substances; yet accidents are truly things, and must have a cause, a real cause; and doubtless the Churches did ascribe the productions of all things, whether accidents or substances, unto God; and in reason he is as truly the cause of what is comproduced and concreated, as of what is produced and created. In *page* 35. this Dr. *Jack.* tells us, what emboldned Divines to assign unto sin only a private being, *viz.* the maxime *that omne ens est bonum*; but that he tells us, *is meant only of a Metaphysical goodness.* No Divines thought otherwise, but they were afraid to assign so much as a Metaphysical goodness to sin, which is simply evil; and such fear would have seized on Dr. *Jackson* also, had he but well weighed what that is which goodness Metaphysical

 doth

doth superad to entity; but that he had never weighed, and yet talks confidently in this whole Controversie concerning the nature of sin, and the efficient of sin, as if his eyes had been blessed to see the things that scarce any saw before him. Book 10. pag. 361, &c. cap. 5, 6. *He goes about to make Apologies for the harsh expressions of some good Writers, and well deserving of all Reformed Churches: Yea, and for the Errors of the Dominicans, or other Schoolmen, (more faulty than he, saith* Zuinglius, *or his Followers, in this point) he wisheth that* Paræus *had never entred into dispute with* Becanus *about this Question, Whether God be the Author of Sin: and is sorry he came off no better, for* Calvin's *credit, or for his own. Avers that* Bellarmine *and* Aquinas, *his Followers, do make God the Author of Sin, by an clear and infallible consequence, as either* Zuinglius *or his Followers have done. He saith the best Apology that can be made for* Aquinas *or* Calvin, *is this, that they were* homines rotundi, *Authors of many various Works; but of this Apology we that follow them are not capable, that if we were called to a strict account, or examination of our Doctrine by the rules of Art, a new question would have risen in our Schools, whether to attribute such acts and decrees unto God as we do, and yet withal to deny that we concludently make him the Author of Sin, doth our argue as great a measure of artificial foppery, or supernatural infatuation, as it would of impiety, to resolve dogmatically* in terminis terminantibus, *that God is the Author of evil.* But what is it that may make this Question allowed in any Academical Act? *Why it might justly be allowed, though the Answer were furnished with no other ground besides that usually avouched distinction, between the act and the obliquity of the act; especially if the distinction were applied unto the first sin of our first Parents, in that sin the act and obliquity are altogether as unseparably annexed, as rotundity is with a Sphere; and to imagine there should be one cause of the act, and another of the obliquity of the act, would be as gross a solœcism, as to assign any other cause of the rotundity of a sphere besides him that frames it.* A discourse so loose, that I much wondred it could find any place in the writings of an Author so formed for learning; for every Fresh-man knows, that there is not the same relation betwixt the act and its obliquity, as there is between rotundity and a sphere; every Fresh-man knows, that there may be a sufficient ground of distinction betwixt things that are

inseparably annexed; every Divine also knows, that the Calvinists do make man to be the cause of the sinfulness of the act, as well as the act itself; all that they say is, that the first cause may afford that concourse to a sinful action, which is necessarily required to every action; and yet not be the cause of the sinfulness of the action: If Dr. *Jackson* think this impossible, he should have told us how God could concur to the good actions of his Saints, and not be the cause of the sinful imperfection which is inseparable from every action that doth not flow from a principle that is perfect. I account he hath forsaken the Reformed Churches, who saith, that God gives any one in this life such a holiness as doth not fall short of the Law; that habitual holiness which falls short of the Law, must necessarily, when it is put forth, produce actions short of the Law; and so far as they fall short of the Law, they are sinful. Now I ask, is God the cause of any imperfect act of love to himself? if he be not, why do I either pray to him for it, or praise him for it? if he be the cause, then he is either the cause of that sinful obliquity necessarily cleaving to it, and making it need pardon; or else he may be the cause of the act, and not of the sinful obliquity that doth inseparably cleave to it. If Dr. *Jackson* affirm the latter, he contradicts his own principle; if the former, he avoucheth that blasphemy which all good men abhor; wherefore he might have done well to reserve the excuse of Polygraphy for himself, *Calvin* and *Aquinas* in this matter do not stand in need of it; as little need had *Pareus* of his sorrow for entring into dispute with *Bertius*, for if ever man had the better, *Pareus* had it that day. About the year 1604. *Betanus* at *Monis* had a disputation concerning God being the Author of Sin, in which he expresly said, that the God of the Calvinists was the Devil: For this among other things *Pareus* undertook him, and *Forestus* and *Molhusius*, and brought them to acknowledge, that whatever became of *Calvin*, it could not truly be said, that the Devil was the God of the Calvinists: What is victory, if this be not victory? when did innocence triumph if not that day, which was *Aug.* 1. *An.* 1608.

For a conclusion of the fifth Chapter, the Doctor takes a leap out of *Holland* into the City of *Sedan*, and tells us *page* 68. *That it is said, that* Franciscus Auratus *was shamefully ejected out of that City for no other reason, but because from*

from Jam. 1. 13. *be largely declared, that God was not the Author of Sin.*

This is said, but by whom? or upon what [illegible] grounds were we promised that the Historical [illegible] Page 114. Narration should be collected out of the *Publick Acts and Monuments of the several Churches*? and shall we now be put off with a *ipse dixit*? If I should write all that hath been said of Dr. *Heylin* and his Party, the World (till such calumnies were confuted) would have but little charity for them. It is said so perhaps by a Fellow of as little judgment as Mr. *Cross*, or by some who had taught his tongue to utter lies; that there was such a Minister as *Antonius*, and that he was (being a well meaning man, but no deep Scholar) inveigled by the eloquence of *Daniel Tilenus*, Professor at *Sedan*, to favor and to vent the Remonstrant Opinions, I grant; but that he was forced to leave his place only for preaching *that God was not the Author of Sin*; is a story fit only to be reported by those who have learned from the Jesuits *calumniari fortiter*. I was much concerned to know, who it was that had so much abused the Doctor, and at length I found him to be *Episcopius*, in his Examen of the Theses of *Facobus Capellus*; in the first page of that Examen he relates this improbable story, but neither tells where he read it, nor from whom he heard it; and we all know that *Episcopius* did never so regard his conscience, but that he would sometimes defile it with a lye; for he came into the Synod with a lye, and went out of it with a lye. On which account the Reader may be the less troubled to find in the same page the Reverend and Religious *Peter Molin*, accused as one that was feign'd to leave *France*, not for his zeal in Religion, but for ungentlemanlike. Indeed I have rarely observed *Episcopius*, either to give a Contraremonstrant his due praise, or not to give a Remonstrant more then his due. *Vossius*, in his Answer to *Curione*, *is a man than whom he had never met with one more modest, and more zealous of a good conscience*, in his Theological instruction, counts it not sufficient to vindicate the Latine Translation of *Castalio* from the censures of *Martinus Gentilis* and *Thuanus*, but he must also commend the *faithfulness and elegance of his French Translation*; whereas Dr. *Rous*, a more competent judge of the elegancy of a French Translation, assures us, *That no French man can read it without*

indignation and laughter, so foolish and ridiculous it is in many places.

We are now come to the sixth and last Chapter of the first Part of the Quinquarticular History, in which the Doctor goes about to enquire *after the causes that might move the Synodists to use such cruelty (severity, he saith, is too mild a word to express their rigor) towards all those who did maintain the five Articles.* An enquiry which supposeth that which is not to be supposed, *viz.* that the Remonstrants error in the five Points, was the sole ground of all the penalties that were inflicted on them; all men who are any way acquainted with the History of the *Belgick* Churches, do know that the Remonstrants were not proceeded against meerly for erring in these five Points, but also for Socinianism and Scepticism, of which to this day they have never been able to purge themselves. Indeed the *Holland* Remonstrants are a Sect of men, that are not fitted for communion with any Christian Churches, except we will call the Assemblies of the furious Anabaptists, or the blasphemous Socinians, by the name of Christian Churches: *They can have no communion with any Church that is either idolatrous, or that maketh any opinion necessary which they judge not necessary; or that teacheth that the Magistrate may hinder and forbid the meetings of Sectaries;* by which means they exclude *Papal, Calvinistical, Lutheran Churches from their communion*, and so separate from all Christendom. Whatever they write about *Moderation, Toleration, Syncretism*, is but hypocrisie; for they cannot have communion with any Churches that will not deny the *Magistrates power to repress Conventicles, and the Churches power to define Heresies, and determine what is necessary to be believed. Arnoldus Poelenburgius* in that little piece of his, wherein he labours to prove, that the Remonstrants cannot with a safe conscience join in communion with the Contraremonstrants, layeth the necessity of separation not on the Heterodoxy of the Contraremonstrants in the five Points, but on their tyranny in imposing Confessions to be subscribed, and in going about to define what is necessary to be believed. *Episcopius* in an Epistle to *Grotius*, bearing date *April* 29. 1631. *Quinquarticularum litem tanti non facerem, nisi conjunctam sibi haberet tam, quæ est de discretione necessariorum dogmatum à non necessariis, sive de mutua Christianorum tolerantia. Video esse qui*

aliter

aliter sentiant; & intra quinque articulos rigide & arrogantes consistendum esse arbitrantur; at eorum sententiæ ego non possum accedere. Epist. Eccles. pag. 694. among which Epistles also it may be seen how *Andreas Rivetinus* doth school the incomparably learned *Isaac Casaubon*, because in his Epistle to Cardinal *Perron*, he let fall an expression commending the fact of the King and Arch-Bishop, in burning the Book of *Vorstius, de Deo & Attributis.* But let us see how well the Historian can acquit the Remonstrants in the five Points.

Their Doctrine (saith he page 70.) *is impeached in these Points of no smaller crimes, then to be destructive of God's grace, introductory of Popery, tending unto spiritual pride, and to sedition, or rebellion in the Civil Government; which Objections I shall here present, as I have done the Arguments of most importance, which were excogitated and enforced against the conclusions and determinations of the Synod in the said five Points; and that being done, I shall return such answers as are made unto them.*

Where I cannot but observe, 1. That whereas he drew up the Charge of the Remonstrants against the Contraremonstrants, and took no notice of any Answer that was or might be returned by the Contraremonstrants; yet now that the Remonstrants are to be impeached, he either finds or makes Answers for them, which is not fair in an Historian.

2. That one part of the impeachment, is the creature and figment of the Doctor's own brain, *viz.* that of *tendency to sedition or rebellion in the Civil Government*; no Contraremonstrant chargeth this on the Doctrine of the Remonstrants, as to the five Points, though sometimes they charge sedition and rebellion on the persons of the Remonstrants.

3. That all the impeachment is not exhibited; for the Remonstrants are charged to overthrow the *prescience, the simplicity, the immutability of God; yea, and all piety and Christian consolation*: but it is wisdom to raise no more enemies then a man thinks he shall be able to contest with. I believe had the Doctor consulted with his Friends, they would have advised him to have mentioned no Objections at all, so miserably and unfortunately are they answered.

"First, It is objected, that this Doctrine (*viz.* the Doctrine "of the Remonstrants) is destructive of God's free grace, re-"viving the old Pelagian Heresies so long since condemned;

"to

"to which objection it is answered, that the Remonstrants "speak as honorably of the grace of God as any other what-"soever; as may be proved by comparing the first branch of "the fourth Article with that golden saying of St. *Augustine*, "*Sine gratia Dei præcaniemus, ut velimus, & subsequente ut "frustra velimus, ad pietatis opera nil valemus*, page 70.

So much do all true Christians abhor whatever Doctrine doth derogate from the grace of God, that the greatest opposers of grace have found it necessary to speak honorably of it. *Pelagius* indeed in his first attempts, never so much as mentioned the word grace, but he soon saw his opinions so propounded would never take; therefore he began to use the word grace, but by it understood no more than Free-will, as appears by that known and commonly quoted place of St. *Aug. Serm. 11. de Verb. Apost. cap. 7. disputantes contra gratiam pro libero arbitrio fecerunt auribus pias & Catholicis offensionem; cœperit horreri, cœperunt ut certa pernicies devitari, cœpit dici illum quod contra gratiam disputarent; & invenerunt ad velandam istam incidiam tale commentum; non inquit contra gratiam Dei disputo quod liberum arbitrium defendo videte acumen sed vitrum, quasi licet vanitate, sed frangitur veritate:* that is, God gave us our Free-will, and therefore whatever we do by the strength of Free-will, is to be ascribed unto Grace: When this would not do, then he began to allow another Grace, that was commonly called *Gratia legis aut doctrinæ*; allowing God not only to bestow on us Free-will, but also by his Law and Precepts to shew and discover unto us our duty. *Aiunt idcò ipsa sine ope divinâ non fieri, quia & hominem Deus creavit cum libero arbitrio, & danda præcepta ipse docet quemadmodum homini sit vivendum*, saith St. *August. de spirit. Lit. cap.* 2. adding also in other places, that they acknowledged a grace of remission vouchsafed to all such as did unfeignedly turn themselves to him. Yea, he stuck not at last to anathematize any one that should say or think that the grace of God was not necessary, not only for every hour and moment, but also for every one of our actions. Who would think that *Pelagius* were not now become as Orthodox as any of the Fathers of the Council before whom he was summoned to appear? but the wretch was as Heterodox as ever, for by grace necessary for every moment, and every act, he understands either only that it is needful that we

should

should keep in memory that our sins are pardoned, or that we should alway have in our eye the example, or Law of Christ. I list not further to prosecute the several stages and steps of Pelagianism; great art was used, as may be seen both in *Vossius* and *Jansenius* to refine the error, that it might be the more easily swallowed down; what I have already noted shews sufficiently, that men may in words acknowledge grace, and yet in works deny it, *sacrificing to their own nets, and burning incense to their own drags.* Whether the Remonstrants are not to be put into this number, will appear if we compare and put together their writings concerning converting grace: I grant that they in the third Article, and in the greatest part of the fourth, speak fairly concerning grace; but did they not in the *Hague*-Conference deny the infusion of any habit or new vital principle? did they not say, that the Spirit acted no otherwise upon the will than by moral suasion? and that nothing was put into the will, or did properly inhere in the Will, but natural Liberty? that one clause, as for the manner of the co-operation of this Grace, is it not to be thought irresistible, doth (saith *Pareus*) take away all that from grace, that was before given unto it. Acta Synod. pag. 318. & pag. 317. If the grace which conferth regeneration be not irresistible, but resistible, such as may be by the will of man disabled, or yet hindered, all that in the third or fourth Article is ascribed to grace, is but an empty smoak of words, and those effects they speak of cannot be ascribed to the grace of God, but indifferently and promiscuously to the wills of men not resisting, they must be ascribed specifically and merely; if so, then all they so extraordinarily vaunt of grace, will be either a fallacy, or a chaos: it will be a chaos, or a fallacy to say; 1. That man hath not faith from himself, and in the strength of his Free-will, but from himself he will have the specification of the operation of grace, because by not resisting grace, he hath distinguished himself from others. 2. That he cannot of himself think, will, or do any good, for in a good of a mere self, will to specify a resistible indifferent operation. 3. That God by his holy Spirit doth regenerate and renew us, &c. for God by his Spirit shall only resistibly, indifferently and promiscuously, and therefore improperly; we our selves shall specifically, immediately, and proper by regenerate and renew our selves. Many other things of this nature are by this learned Professor there urged, which the Remonstrants will never be able by all their sophistry to evade.

evade. This also will make good the other charge against the Remonstrants Doctrine, taken notice of by the Doctor *page* 73. viz. *That it doth naturally incline a man to the sin of pride:* For the removal of which he would offer something, *page* 74. but such a something as is next to nothing, viz. *That Doctrine must needs more cherish humane presumption, which puffeth men up with the certainty of their election, the infallibility of assisting and persisting grace; and the impossibility of falling from the attaining of that salvation which they have promised themselves, than that which leaves these Points uncertain, which puts a man to the continual necessity of calling upon God, and working out the way unto his salvation with fear and trembling*: For who will not reply to him, that in the Contraremonstrant way, there is more ground for prayer, and for fear and trembling, since the Contraremonstrants attribe to God, the working in us both to will and to do, which the Remonstrants cannot: The Remonstrants must needs, if they will not contradict themselves, affirm, That God doth, *pari gradu & modo*, in the like degree and measure will and work antecedently the conversion of those who are converted, and of those who are not converted; if so, what ground for fear, sith man can convert himself when he pleaseth, and restore the lost habits when he listeth. The Apostle *Paul*, one of the rarest examples of humility, did sure best know what's most likely to quell and subdue high thoughts, and proud imaginations; and what weapons doth he make use of to this end? why two such interrogations, as must needs prick the bladder, with the Contraremonstrant, but not with the Remonstrant. Let it be demanded of a Calvinist, *What hast thou, that thou hast not received?* He will answer, *Nothing*. Let it be enquired, Who made thee to differ? He will reply, *The meer undeserved omnipotent grace of God*. But a *Grevincovius* will say, *He made himself to differ*; but perhaps no Arminian else will say so: Yes, Mr. *Playfer* in his *Appello Evangelium* hath said it; and all Remonstrants must say so, that will not fly from their principles: To manifest which, I shall only English something out of the *Declaratio sententiæ Remonstrant. circa Articulum cap.* 3, & 4. *pag.* 21. *If it be enquired, why this man is converted, and another not? we answer, this man is converted, because God converts him, not opposing any new contumacy; the other is not converted, because he doth oppose new contumacy.*

But

But you will enquire, why this man opposeth new contumacy, not the other? we answer, this man opposeth, because he will oppose; the other opposeth not, because he is moved by grace, ne velit opponere, *to have no mind to oppose. If you enquire, whether he who opposeth not new contumacy, and by consequent is converted, hath greater grace than he that opposeth, and by consequent is not converted? we answer, that antecedent and preventing grace may be equal; but the former hath co-operating, the latter hath not.* Hence it is plain, that it is man, according to the *Remonstrants*, who make *sufficient* grace to be *effectual*; and by necessary consequence *man* doth make *himself* a *penitent*, a *believer*, a *regenerate person*: than which *Pelagius* himself could not write or speak higher, or more proudly.

Page 72. The Historian is pleased to mention another charge against the Remonstrants Opinions, *viz. That they symbolize so much with the Church of* Rome, *that they serve only as a bridge for Popery, to pass over into any Church into which they can obtain admission: And further tells us, that this clamor being first raised in* Holland, *was afterwards much cherished, and made use of by the Puritan or Calvinian party among us in* England.

Where I take notice, 1. That he gives a false account of the rise and first beginning of this charge, that these points do, where they are entertained, dispose mens minds for the receptions and entertainment of Popery; for before the troubles raised by *Barnevelt*, our Divines did suspect *conditionate election, and falling away from grace*, &c. to be an inlet to Popery, as is manifest from the Letter of the Heads of the University of *Cambridge* to their Chancellor, written upon the occasion of *Barett*'s and *Baro*'s preaching or reading things agreeable to the Opinions that are now called Arminians; in which Letter, bearing date *March* 8. 1595. 'tis affirmed, *That if passage were permitted to those Errors, the whole Body of Popery would by little and little break in upon them, to the overthrow of Religion, and consequently the withdrawing of many there, and elsewhere, from true obedience to her Majesty; and therefore in the close, they humbly beseech his Lordships good aid and assistance for the suppressing in time, not only of those Errors, but even of gross Popery, like by such means, in time easily to creep in among them, as they found by late experience it had dangerously begun.*

Unto

Unto this and many other testimonies alledged by Mr. *Hickman* in his Λεξεις σχολαστικα διαλυσεις the Doctor will yield no assent, but answereth three things, *page* 73. 1. *Why should not a general compliance with the Friars of St.* Dominick, *be thought as ready a way to bring in Popery, as any such compliance with the Friars of St.* Francis? To which the Answer is easie, because the Dominicans opinions do much tend to the exaltation of grace, the subjection of carnal reason to Faith; so do not the Tenents of the Franciscans or Jesuits: Now where grace is exalted, and carnal reason is subjected; there Popery, which hath its foundation in carnal reason and pride, doth not so easily prevail or obtain. This the Pope understood well enough, which made his Bull to roar so loud against the, in this point, *Orthodox Jansenians.*

2. *The Melanchthonian, or moderate Lutherans, which make up infinitely the greatest part of the Lutheran Churches, agree in these points with the Jesuits or Franciscan Friers, and yet are still as far from relapsing to the Church of* Rome, *as when they made the first separation from it.*

Where, 1. it is strange that one pretending to History, should represent the infinitely far greater part of the Lutheran Churches as Melanchthonian, or moderate Lutherans; when as it is known, that a very great, if not the greatest part of the Lutherans, are as far from being Melanchthonians, or moderate, as Dr. *Heylin* is from being a Presbyterian, or Puritan. But it seems if men be never so violent for *Ubiquity, Consubstantiation, Images*, if they be but against *Predestination*, they shall pass for meek and moderate, and Melanchthonians.

2. It may a little be questioned, whether the present Lutherans be as far from relapsing to the Church of *Rome*, as were those Lutherans who made the first separation from it. I know not how much there may be of truth in the talk that hath lately filled our ears, concerning unions and accommodations betwixt the Lutheran and Roman Churches; it would be very strange if the Lutherans, having all this while been bred up among Images, should be as averse from Image-worship, as were the first Reformers.

3. It is as false as what is most false, that the Lutherans do agree with the Franciscans or Jesuits in these Points, *Maccalius* in his *Heterodoxia Calvinismi*, *disput.* 5. *pag.* 15. re-

jecteth

jecteth both the Dominicans and Jesuits; the Dominicans, as inclining to the Stoicks; the Jesuits, as falling in with the Pelagians: Afterwards he rejects the Jesuits *Scientia media*, confessing that *Vatius* doth well and unanswerably prove against them, that there is nothing knowable but what is the object either of the knowledg of *simple intelligence*, or *vision*. Speaking also of *Arminius*, he will not undertake for him. *Tornovius* openly rejects the Arminians, as of a contrary judgment from the Lutherans, *Miscel. Sacrorum lib. 1. pag. 710. Vorstiniani, Arminiani, & similes in Belgio, quando aiunt filios non prædestinari ad vitam æternam, idem dicunt, non dicunt nobiscum sentiunt.* He that would be more fully convinced of this, that the Lutherans are not Arminians, may please to consult what *Durfeldius*, a Divine of *Rostock*, hath written against *Johannes Assuerus Amsingus*, where he shall find the Arminians accused of Pelagianism, before the chief Doctors of those Universities that follow the Augustan Confession. This I take on trust from Dr. *Rivet*, having not as yet had the opportunity to see the Author. But casting my eye on *Gerhard*'s Son's Epistle Dedicatory, prefixed to his Father's Comment on *Deuteronomy*, I found him use no obliging language of the Arminians; for he saith, that they have *ad dogmata Socinianorum admodum proximos aures*; and he calls *Simon Episcopius*, the *Infalix Arminianismi interpolator*. But the cutting killing Answer (which he cannot mention without triumph) is still behind, and is thus worded:

If Arminianism be so ready a bridge for passing over to Popery, it would be very well worth the knowing, how and by what means it should come to pass, that so few of the Remonstrants in the Belgick *Provinces, and none of those whom they call Arminians in the Church of* England, *should in so long a time, pass over that bridge, notwithstanding all the provocations of want and scorn which were put upon the one, and have been since multiplied upon the other.*

If this be so well worth knowing, I shall be the more easily pardoned if I take some pains for the Doctor's information.

1. It is asked, Why so few of the *Belgick* Remonstrants did turn Papists? For answer I will not ask, How if the Contraremonstrants Opinions did as much incline and dispose men to Popery as the Remonstrants, it came to pass, that not one Contraremonstrant ever went over to *Rome*? but

but I forbear that, and shall offer two reasons which might (as I conceive) hinder the *Belgick* Remonstrants from turning Roman Catholicks. 1. Their Wives and Children might hinder them from passing over this Bridge; forsake these dear Relations they could not, and yet if they did not forsake them, they could promise themselves no good reception, or kind entertainment among the Pontificians. 2. The Remonstrants might therefore not turn Papists, because they were resolved to turn to a worse sort of Hereticks, *viz.* the Socinians. But did the Remonstrants strike in with the Socinians? Yes, that they did; as I will undertake to prove by as good evidence as can be expected in matter of fact: Till I be called to make good this undertaking, I refer my Reader to *Vedelius*'s *Arcana Arminii*, and *Horknebeck*'s *Apparatus ad Socc. conf.*

2. *It is asked, Why none of those whom they call Arminians in England, notwithstanding all provocations of want and scorn, are turned Papists?* To answer this, times must be distinguished;

1. Before Bishop *Laud* ruled and governed, those who embraced the Opinions since called Arminian, were indeed out of the way to preferment; but who knows not that many of them turned Papists? *Barret* did so in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time: And the Heads of Houses in *Cambridge* complain in the before mentioned Letter, that they had found by experience, that Popery came in among them at the door of Arminianism (so I may call it by a prolepsis.)

2. When Bishop *Laud* ruled and disposed of all Ecclesiastical preferment, Arminians had no provocations from want or scorn, yet even then some of them turned Papists.

3. Since the breaking out of the late unhappy Civil Wars and Confusions, there hath a cup of trembling and astonishment gone round the three Nations, and Divines of all persuasions have been made to drink of it; all Ministers, by what names soever dignified, by what opinions soever distinguished, have been made the filth and off-scouring of all things; but that scorn or want hath befallen any one meerly for being a favourer of Arminianism, is more then I know, more then Dr. *Heylin* can prove: Sure I am, that many of those Army-men, who gloried in nothing more, then in trampling all Law and Right under foot, were Arminians; and he who

was

was the only Divine that dared to justifie that horrid fact, *the murdering of the late King, is known to all to be a great stickler for Arminianism:* But it were to be wished, that no Arminians had, during the late Troubles, forsaken the Church of *England*, and took sanctuary in the Synagogue of *Rome*. I was bred up with Mr. *W. H.* at *Katherine-Hall* in *Cambridge*, who was looked upon by the whole Society, as a very studious, ingenious, hopeful person, and was thereupon chosen Fellow before he was Master of Arts; but by acquaintance with some, he began highly to dote on the *Common Prayer-book*, and would hear good Sermons at *Cambridge*, and walk over to *Coton* on purpose that he might hear the Liturgy; withal he had sucked in Arminianism: but within the compass of two years, he fell to downright Popery, and is now, as they say, a Seminary Priest. I would not have mentioned this story, but that it is notorious, I suppose, all *Cambridge* over. What shall we think of the late Bishop of *Glocester*? was not he called and reputed an Arminian? and did he not die a Son and Member of the Church of *Rome*? The present Bishop of *Exeter*, I confess, makes an Essay to clear him from Popery, but very unhappily; whilest he goes about to prove that he did not die a Papist, he makes him not a Christian for the former part of his life. These are the words used concerning him, *page 637. No wonder if dying and dejected, he chose rather to depart in communion with the Church of* Rome, *than to adhere to the Church of* England, *which he thought now decayed and dissolved (at least as to its visible order and polity) if not quite destroyed; not that he owned (I hope) a communion, or conciliation with the Roman Church as Popish, but as far as it was Christian.* If dying he was reconciled to the Church of *Rome* as Christian, then before he was at enmity with it as Christian; and if so, he was not a Christian. I hope a man may adhere to the Church of *England*, and yet depart in communion with the Church of *Rome* as Christian? In a word, there was not many years since a Book published, in which were contained the names of many of those who had lately revolted to Popery, let Dr. *Heylin* read over that Catalogue, and then tell me, whether it was not a strange piece of boldness to ask so confidently, Why none of those who are called Arminians, had in all these times turned Papists?

Page 76. Finally it is objected (but the objection rather con-

teacheth the men then the doctrine) *that the Arminians are a Faction, a turbulent and seditious Faction, so found in the United Provinces from their very first sprouting. To this he answers*, page 77. *that there is nothing in the Doctrine of the Arminians (as it relates to the five Points in difference) which can dispose the Professors of it to any such practices.*

I know not that any one hath in print affirmed, that the Arminian Doctrine doth naturally lead men to Faction and Sedition; but if any one have affirmed any such thing, he may prove his affirmation by an argument which cannot easily be answered, *viz. Those Doctrines which do incline men to Pride, do naturally lead men to Faction and Sedition. The Arminian Doctrines do incline men to Pride; ergo.* The Minor hath been before confirmed, the Major is undeniable, as being built upon plain express Scriptures.

But the Doctor, contenting himself nakedly to affirm, that there is nothing in the Arminian Doctrines, which can dispose the Professors of it to seditious practices, tells us from some, that it is not so with the Doctrine of the other Party, *by which men's actions are so ordered and predetermined by the will of God, even to the taking up of a straw*, ut nec plus boni nec minus mali; *that it is neither in their power to do more good, or commit less evil then they do; and then according to that Doctrine, all treasons, murders, and seditions, are to be excused, as unavoidable in them that commit the same*, &c. page 78.

There is, I remember, a very noted story out of *Holland*, concerning an Anonymous Libeller, who would needs father it upon the reverend and learned Dr. *Carolus de Maets*, *That God hath decreed and determined, that all things should be done in that time, manner, place, and order that in time they are done; and that according to this decree and divine determinon, a man cannot do more good or evil then he doth or omitteth:* Quite leaving out the explication that was used by the judicious Professor, *viz. that in a divided sense, a man may do more good, and avoid more evil then he doth.* Just so doth our Historian proceed, making the Calvinists to affirm that *absolutely*, which they affirm not but *with a distinction. In sensu composito*, a man cannot do more good than he doth; nor abstain from more evil then he abstaineth from; but in a divided sense he may: Which made our Divines of *Great Britain*, in the Synod of *Dort*, among the Heterodox assertions which they

they rejected, place this; *Hominum non posse plus boni facere quam facit, nec plus mali omittere quam omittit: falsum hoc est & absonum, sive de homine irregenito & animali intelligatur, sive etiam de renato & gratia sanctificante suffulto.* The learned *Camero* was charged by his angry Adversary *Tilenus*, to hold, that man could not do more good then he doth, nor omit more evil then he emitteth: To this, what answereth he? *Ego vero libens agnosco multa esse, &c. pag. mihi 704. I willingly acknowledge, that there are many things, which uttered simply, do, and that deservedly, breed offence; which very things, if they be expressed conditionally, appear such, as that no man dare contradict them; e. c. If any one shall say, that* Pharaoh *could not let Israel go, he would offend the ears of all, if he add not, unless God soften the heart of the wicked man; but God hath not decreed to do that, therefore it shall not be; it cannot be, that* Pharaoh *let Israel go: now his speech will offend no man, no not* Tilenus *himself; who doth not deny, but that in hardened persons there doth lie, and that by the decree of God, a necessity of sinning.* Nor can the Arminians (those of them who assert Divine præscience) tell how to extricate themselves out of the labyrinth, but by the help of this distinction, *in sensu composito & diviso*; which is made use of by *Curcellæus*, in his Epistle to *Limburgius* from *Amsterdam*, *Decemb.* 13. 1653.

To be short, there is no Doctrine that can more incline the heart to quietness, patience, contentedness, (all which are perfectly contrary to sedition and rebellion) than doth the Augustinian, or (if that must be the name) Calvinian Doctrine; for this being once firmly imprinted on our hearts, that all things come to pass according to the determinate counsel of God's will, that the worst of Persecutors are but the staff of his indignation, do but fulfil the will of his purpose, when they must cross and go against his legislative will; what place is there left for murmuring? what place for envy or revenge against second causes and instruments? It was not an Arminian, but a Calvinistical apprehension of God's providence about sin, which *Joseph* had, when unto his Brethren, fearing lest after their Father's death, their old unkindness should be remembred, he answered, *Gen.* 50. 19, 20. *Fear not, for am I in the place of God? but as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass as it is this*

day, to save much people alive. Nor would he be understood of the *otiosa permissio* (that Mr. *Calvin* writes against) when he saith, *Gen.* 45. 8. *It was not you that sent me hither, but God.*

This notwithstanding Dr. *Heylin* will quote some testimonies and authorities tending to prove, that Calvinism, or doctrinal Puritanism, is destructive to all Civil Policy and Government; some scraps he produceth from the old Lord *Burleigh*, from the Bishop of *Oxford*, *Rochester*, *St. Davids*, from Dr. *Brooks*, once Master of *Trinity* Colledge; but he is, I believe, afraid to come either to the pole, or to the scale; either to weigh, or to number authorities with us. We'll undertake among English Protestant Divines and Statesmen, to produce forty who deny Calvinism to have any tendency to Sedition, for one who hath laid any such thing to its charge; and 'tis a shrewd sign that the Doctor was hard put to it to find out Abettors of his Cause, else he would not have set *Cerberus* to bark against his Adversaries, which yet, to his no small shame, he doth, *pag.* 79, 80. This *Campneys* was in *Edward* the Sixths time a Papist, a railing furious Papist; and as such did suffer, though not unto death. At the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths*, he began to make disturbance in the Church, nibling at the Doctrine that was generally received, and entertained by men every way his betters; in so much that he was generally voiced to be Popish and Pelagian: His Pamphlet, (if it might be called his) unto which he was ashamed to put his name, was quickly confuted by Mr. *Crowly* and *Veron*, men famous in their generation, of more judgement and insight in the ancient Fathers, then to ascribe the *Quæstiones Vet. & Novi Testamenti* to St. *Austin*, which every Puny knows to be the fruit of some Pelagian brain.

I had thought to have followed our Historian, and to have given some account of his second and third Part, in which he goes about to perswade us, that the Doctrine now called Arminianism, was and is the Doctrine of the Reformed Church of *England*; but this work is already done to satisfaction by *Theophilus Churchman*, in his Review; if any say, this is but a shift; I do here desire either Dr. *Heylin*, or any Friend of his, to direct me to the best Argument in either of those two Books, and if I do not presently make it appear that that Argument

gument is either so weak, as not to need an Answer, or else already answered, I shall then yield the Cause: Till this be done, I shall not think that that can be the Doctrine of the Church, which was contradicted by all, or the major part of our learned Divines and Professors; or that the whole Church, or any lawful Authority in the Church, would impose it on her own Members, to recant her own Doctrine: Seeing the Church is wont to enjoyn Recantation to those who contradict her Articles, why she should enjoyn the Recantation of Arminianism, if that be agreeable to her Articles? he had need have the wisdom of all the seven wise men that can shew a reason. I conclude, humbly beseeching all those who are entrusted with Ecclesiastical Authority, *that they would not be so intent on Discipline, as to neglect Doctrine; that they would not let Pelagianism enter in, under pretence of opposing Puritanism; that* Calvin's *Institutions, and the 39. Articles which a Convocation in* Oxford *joyned together, may not now be put asunder.*

Here I had thought to put an end to my Animadversions on the Doctor's History, supposing it needless to wipe off the aspersion of Arminianism from the English Church, which scarce any one of our own for fourscore years had the confidence to cast on her; yet having since considered, that men easily believe that which they greatly desire; and finding many, very many mens wits at work, to gather up any thing that may evince so much as the least probability, that a meerly conditional election, was never reprobated by the Martyrs, Composers of our Homilies and Articles, I have taken up resolution to give my self the unpleasing trouble of running through the second and third Part of the Doctor's History, that so the Reader may not have so much as a straw left to stumble at.

The first thing done in the second Part, is to lay down the Doctrine of our Church, concerning *the fall of man, and his recovery by Christ:* Which Doctrine should have been gathered from our Articles, or from some Homilies purposely written of those subjects; but the Doctor gathers it from the *Homily of Christ's Nativity*; many of his dear Friends will con him no thanks for so doing; but I am content to let all that he hath collected, *pag.* 4, 5, 6. pass, as the unquestionable Doctrine of our Church. Yea, I rejoyce to find it acknowledged,

ledged, *That* Adam *by his Fall became the Image of the Devil, the Bondslave of Hell, and nothing else but a Lump of Sin; and that this so great and miserable a Plague, fell not only on him, but also on his Posterity and Children for ever.* Hence I infer, that they are no Sons of our Church, who either quite deny Original Sin, or make it to be no Sin properly so called. I infer also secondly, that the story of which the Doctor is so proud, *page* 7. doth not represent the case in which God found fallen man: For the King of *Lombard* found in *Lamistus* both a power to lay hold on his Hunting-spear, and a willingness to save himself by it; but if man be the Image of the Devil, and nothing but a lump of Sin, he hath no power till it be given him, so much as to accept of Grace offered; nay, his carnal mind is enmity against all the Laws by which God would bring him to Happiness. As for the Principle laid down, *page* 6. towards the end, *That as were the Acts of God in their right production, so were they primitively in his intention:* It is very unfitly expressed, and either the meaning of it is only this, that as God did put forth his Acts in time, so he purposed externally to put them forth, or else it is most absurd, and contrary to all Principles of Philosophy and Theology.

The next attempt is foully to bespatter *Wickliff*, *Frith*, *Barnes*, *Tindall*. As concerning *Wickliff*, it is said, *page* 8. *That it cannot be proved, that our Reformers had any eye at the man; and that his Field had more Tares in it then Wheat; and that his Books will afford all the Sects and Heresies among us, the grounds of their several dotages.* To make good this charge, we are referred to *Thomas Waldensis*, and *Nicholas Harpsfield*, and least we should except against them, to (that which is more liable to exception) the Convocation in *Henry* the Eighths time, *Anno* 1536. *pag.* 819.

To which I say first, that neither *Waldensis* nor *Harpsfield*, nor that discontented Convocation, are meet Witnesses against *Wickliff* or his Followers, for they all lay to their charge things which we can manifestly prove they alway abhorred.

I set against these, 1. The University of *Oxford*, which in a Convocation *Anno* 1406. give Letters testimonial to *Wickliff*, declaring him to be a man of honesty and great worth.

2. The judgement of *John Huss*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, who are acknowledged to have lighted their candle at his: and

John

John Hus had such an opinion of him, that he wished no greater happiness, than to be where the Soul of *Wickliff* was.

3. Finally his own works, whether printed or manuscript; out of which, or some of which, Dr. *James* hath collected enough to prove his conformity with the Church of *England* Reformed.

4. I will take a particular view of all the Errors fathered on him by these men, or rather by the Doctor out of them.

1. *The Sacraments of the Altar is nothing but a piece of Bread.* Mr. *Fox* makes mention of *Wickliff's* Wicket, and I my self have it, as it was reprinted at *Oxford* by *Joseph Barnes*, Prefaced by the Revered *Henry Jackson* of *Corpus Christi* College; by the which any one may see, he speaks reverently of the blessed Eucharist, and strongly confuteth Transubstantiation. It is there expressly said, *The Bread consecrated is Christ's Body in figurative speech, which is bid to the understanding of Sinners.*

2. *That Priests have no more authority to minister Sacraments then Lay-men.* This is a calumny, as Dr. *James* his Apology for *Wickliff* will manifest; yet if he had maintained, that a Lay-man, or Woman, in case of necessity, may administer the Sacrament of Baptism, he had been in an error, but in an error common to him, with the Popish Church, and the Lutheran Church, and our own Church, till headed by King *James*: Yea, had he held that a Lay-man, or woman, may administer the Lord's Supper, I hope the Doctor will not much swagger against him on that score, seeing the beloved of his Soul, *Simon Episcopius*, affirms as much as that comes to, making also the immortal *Grotius* his Vouchee for this opinion; lo his words in his Answer to the sixty four Questions, *page* 39. "It is not absolutely necessary, that "the Administration of the Supper should be performed by "some Officer of the Church; and therefore because in Christ "there is neither male nor female, it may in like manner be "performed by all; where that Order obtains, that some Of-"ficer should perform the Administration, that Order is to "be kept for peace-sake, and reverence of the Order; where "the Officer is not present, or cannot be present in the "publick Assembly, it is lawful for any man, especially a "meet man, to perform that Administration; for why should

"the Administration of the Lord's Supper be thought for-
"bidden to them, unto whom it is allowed to speak and teach
"in the Assembly? But unto all men doth the Apostle permit
"to speak in the Church, because he does except women,
"though meet understanding women, that are married, and
"subject to Husbands, as is manifest out of both Texts,
"1 *Cor.* 14. 34, 35. 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. for Virgins and Widows,
"the Apostle seemeth not to except, especially if endowed with
"the gift of Prophecy from God, 1 *Cor.* 11. 5. because unto
"them do not belong the reasons for which the Apostle would
"have women to hold their peace in the Assemblies, not to
"teach, but to be in silence; although it is certain where
"men, especially meet, are present, that it is fit that they
"should be prefer'd to any kind of women whatever in teach-
"ing and administring. I add, where no men meet, but
"only women religious and godly, that there is no cause
"why they may not teach one another, and celebrate the
"Lord's Supper among themselves, seeing that the precept
"of celebrating the remembrance of Christ's death, and of
"testifying our mutual communion, belongs not less to wo-
"men then to men, *Gal.* 3. 28. Verily if we view the ancient
"custom of the Church, which *Grotius* hath alledged out of
"*Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, we cannot doubt but that the Ad-
"ministration of both Sacraments were granted to Laicks, and
"sometimes to women.

3. *That all things ought to be common.* This is a most perfect calumny; *Wickliff* held no community, except that which hath nothing against it, but *covetousness the root of all evil*, as Dr. *James* hath manifested.

4. *That it is as lawful to Christen a Child in a Tub of Water as home, or in a Ditch by the way, as in a Font-stone in the Churches.* And what if *Wickliff*, at a time when the publick Administration of Baptism was defiled with most dreadful Superstition, did tell people, that Baptism was not by God's Law tied to a Font-stone in the Church? would not the Doctor have told them as much had he lived in those days? yea, do not all say as much at this very day? For my part I heartily rejoyce in the usages of these Churches, that have Baptisteries placed in the Temple, so as the Administration of the Ordinance may be observed by all the Members of the Congregation. Nevertheless Antiquity used Tubs of Water, and Ditches,

Ditches, or Lakes, not Font-stones; of the Apostolical times this will not be denied; for the two following Centuries it is manifest by *Justin Martyr*, in his second Apology, and *Tertullian* in his third Chapter *de Corona Militis*, that it was customary not to bring water to the Church, but to carry the Church to the Water. I would thank that Scholar that would from any undoubted Record of Antiquity, shew me that Font-stones, placed near the Church door, came in before the fourth Century.

5. *That it is as lawful at all times to confess unto a Lay-man as unto a Priest.* Is not this a shrewd Heresie? delivered long before *Wickliff* by St. *James*, who not only allows, but enjoyns us to confess our faults one to another; yet to say, that Confession unto a Lay-man, is to all intents and purposes as available as unto a Priest, is an error, and never owned by *Wickliff*.

6. *That it is not necessary, or profitable, to have any Church, or Chappel to Pray in, or to do any Divine Service in.* A Church is not necessary to perform Divine Service in, that is certain; no, nor yet profitable; so as to commend our services to God; but yet usually Temples are more convenient than any other places in our Parishes; and therefore we are to rejoyce, that they are continued to us, notwithstanding the fury of the late Wars, and to use them, making no question for conscience sake. *Wickliff* doubtless used to Pray, and Preach in his Church at *Lutterworth*, neither thinking that his Church did sanctifie his services, nor defile them; and of this belief am I. Never do I find it so much as mentioned, or objected against *Wickliff*, that he performed Divine Service in any other then a Consecrated place. To *William Swinderby* indeed I find it was objected, "That many times and oft "he had come to a Desart Wood, cleped *Der-* "*walf* Wood, and there in a Chappel not hallowed, but accurled Shepherds Hulk, presumed to sing, but rather to "curse in contempt of the Keys. But he replies, that this was falsly put on him; saying, it was a Chappel where a Priest useth to sing certain days in the year with great solemnity.

Vide Fox in Richard II.

7. *That burying in Church-yards is unprofitable, and in vain.* *Wickliff*'s own Body was buried in his Church-yard, after he had served God in his generation; had he accounted it unprofitable

profitable to have such a burying place, why did he not tak order with some of his Friends to have his Carcase laid elsewhere? Were it not a custom received in our Church to bury in the Church, or Church-yard, I would never petition that it might be made a custom, knowing that from the beginning it was not so, either in the Jewish or Christian Church.

8. *That Holy-days ordained and instituted by the Church (and taking in the Lord's day for one) are not to be observed and kept but reverence, in as much as all days are alike.* The Parenthesis here is of the Doctor's own adding; the Convocation represents the Wickliffists as distinguishing betwixt Sundays and Holy-days, Article 35. We may give a shrewd ghess at *Wickliff*'s Opinion, by the Opinion of *Hierom* of *Prague*, which was, as *Bernard Luzenberg* represents it, *That we must cease from work no day but the Lord's day.* To this the *Bohemian* Churches do stand to this very day, keeping some days indeed besides the Lord's day, but meerly as circumstances, not as parts of worship; and therefore so soon as Divine Service is over, allowing people to follow their work; yet granting no such allowance on the Lord's day, which they aver to be of Divine institution.

9. *That it is sufficient, and enough to believe, though a man do no good works.* This is but the Heresie of St. *Paul*, only malitiously represented by *Wickliff*'s Adversaries; and it is at this day the stone that every Papist carries in his pocket, to throw at the heads of all Protestants whatsoever, whether Calvinist or Lutheran: it were to be wished that some Lutherans had no more given occasion to this reproach, then *Wickliff* did.

10. *That no humane Laws, or Constitutions, do oblige a Christian.* 'Tis added by the Convocation, *but such as be in the Gospels, or* Paul's *Epistles, or the New Testament*; and why the Doctor omitted this addition, or restriction, no man can give a good reason; such limitation doth take off all the offensiveness of the universal negative; for there can be no good Law, or Constitution humane, but what is to be found either expresly, or implicitely in the New Testament. The New Testament requires obedience to all humane Laws, that are not contrary to the eternal Rule of Righteousness, or some Divine positive institution, under the

the severest penalties, and from the most perfect motive.

11. *That God never gave grace nor knowledg to a great person, or rich man, and that they in no wise follow the same.* This was indeed the opinion of *Pelagius*, with whose Heresies *Wickliff* was never thought to be infected; that *Wickliff* ever held any such opinion, is neither true nor probable. He was so much favoured by the Nobility and Gentry of this Nation, who had great estates, and ever upon increase, that it cannot be thought he would ever broach a Tenet, that left none of them any hope of salvation. Dr. *George Abbot*, afterwards Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, mentions in his Answer to Dr. *Hill*, a Manuscript he had seen of one *Henry Knighton*, a Canon of *Leicester*; that Manuscript is now published, with some others, by *Cornelius Bee*, the learned *Selden* having put a large Preface to the whole Book; from that Preface I collect, that *Knighton* was contemporary to *Wickliff*, and so was the more able to give us right information of him. He never chargeth *Wickliff* with denying grace or salvation to all rich men; some such thing indeed he fathers upon *William Swinderby*, page 2646. but if he had indeed held any other impossibility of rich mens salvation, then what is the clear result of our Saviour's own speech, why was no such thing charged on him in the Process made against him by the Bishop of *Lincoln*, or *Hereford*; both which are related by Mr. *Fox*, and have not one tittle of this import in them.

All that I shall further add, is

First, *Wickliffists* did maugre all the malice of their Adversaries increase; *Knighton* saith, *page 2666. Secta illa maximo in honore illis diebus habebatur*, &c. *that Sect in those days was in great honour, and so multiplied, that you would scarce see two in the way, but one of them was a Disciple of Wickliff.*

Secondly, That *Wickliff* laid the Foundation of our Reformation in *England*, as well as of that in *Bohemia*. By three means especially did he advance our Reformation in *England*.

1. By Translating the Scriptures into the English Tongue; by this means kindling in his Country-men a desire to understand the last Will and Testament of their blessed Saviour. By him, saith *Knighton*, page 2644. *the Gospel was made vulgar, and more open to Laicks, and Women knowing how*

to read; *that it was wont to be to Clergy-men very learned*, *and well understanding*.

2. By asserting the due Power of Kings in their own Kingdoms, against the Usurpations of the Popes of *Rome*. Of this the Pope was very sensible, and feelingly complained of it in his Letter to the University of *Oxford*, and to King *Richard* the Second, 1378. saying, that *Wickliff* broached the Errors of *Marsilius* of *Padua*, and of *John* of *Gandune* of unworthy memory. The very same complaint did Pope *Gregory* the Twelfth make, in the time of King *Henry* the Fourth; a Copy of this Letter I have not seen, but Dr. *Abbot* had seen it; and any *Oxford* man may see it in the Book that Mr. *Hare* gave to the University. How much *Marsilius* had shaken the Pillars of the Papal Jurisdiction, is not unknown to Scholars; it were to be wished that his *Defensor* were in more of their hands: And *Wickliff* indeed trod in his steps, (or rather in the steps of *William Ocham*, his senior in *Merton* College) for he strenuously asserted, "That the Lordship of all "Temporalities, both of Secular men and Religious, per-"tained to the King; for else he were not King of *England*, "but of a very small part of it; and that the Kingdom of "*England* may lawfully (in case of necessity) for its own de-"fence, detain and keep back the Treasure of the Kingdom, "that it be not carried away to foreign and strange Nations, "the Pope himself demanding and requiring the same under "pain of Censure, and by vertue of Obedience.

3. He corrected and curbed the exorbitance of the Episcopal Power also; asserting, that the Order of Priesthood in its own nature and substance, receiveth no degrees of more or less; and yet notwithstanding, the power of inferiour Priests is in these days, upon due consideration, restrained, and sometimes again in time of necessity enlarged. See his exposition on the Conclusions in Mr. *Fox*, *Rich.* 3. *page* 567. one of his Articles condemned by the Council of *Constance* was, *that Hallowing of Churches*, *Confirmation of Children*, *the Sacrament of Orders*, *be reserved to the Pope and Bishops only for lucre*. This notion was sucked in by all our *Martyrs*, and even by those Papists that were not wedded to the *Court* of *Rome*, as well as to the *Church* of *Rome*, as may be seen in the *Institution of a Christian man*, concerning the Sacrament of Orders. And that our first Reformers in King *Edward*'s days,

days, proceeded on the same Principle, will appear undeniable by that which Mr. *Stillingfleet* hath Printed in his *Irenicum*, out of Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*'s Manuscript. But enough of *Wickliff*.

Tindal, *Barnes*, *Frith*, are the next whom the Doctor mentions; and about them he spends *pag.* 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. to what purpose he spent so much paper, or made so bold with his Readers patience, I wot not. Mr. *H. H.* had only said, that they, and as many others as lived and suffered before the Reformation, if they gave us their judgements in the five Points, gave them agreeable to Mr. *Calvin*. This the Doctor in effect grants ὑπερ ἐδει δαιμονα, only adds for a close, that *as these suffered death before the publick undertaking of Reformation under* Edward VI. *so nothing was ascribed to their Authority by the first Reformers.* The latter part of which clause is as false, as the former is true; something was by the first Reformers ascribed to the Authority of *Tindal*; for notwithstanding King *Henry* the Eighths Proclamation, the Act of Parliament, and Sir *Thomas More*'s active endeavors to suppress and smother, and abolish *Tindal*'s Translation, yet it came to light, and was, being corrected by *Thomas Matthews*, Printed with Annotations, by the special priviledge of King *Edward* the Sixth, *Anno* 1551. Yea, the Bibles used in Churches from 1549. to 1577. were those of *Tindal*'s Translation; called also *Coverdale*'s, because he had made some corrections of *Tindal*'s. And they who have taken pains to compare Books, say, that the Psalter now enjoyned to be used, is agreeable to *Tindal*'s Translation; as also were the Epistles and Gospels, till this last Edition of the Liturgy.

And if any thing in this kind was ascribed to the Authority of *Tindal*, something also was ascribed, at least by Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* (one of our Reformers) to the Authority of *John Frith*; for he seems to have received his Faith in the Doctrine of the Sacrament from him, and with his Heifer did he plow, in his Answer to *Stephen Winchester*: *Rationes argumenta atque è doctoribus petita testimonia* (Johannis Frithi) *singula commemorare ut immensi esset negotii, ita nec valde necessarii, præsertim cum Archiepiscopus* Cantuariensis *in suo adversus* Wintoniensem *Apologetico idem abunde præstitisse videatur, hinc contracta maxima præsidiorum materia quibus ad-*

versus

cursus cum nititur nec scio an illi magis Authori hujusce doctrinæ fidem acceptam debuit Archiepiscopus quam huic adolescenti. *John Fox* in his Commentary in Latine, *pag.* 130.

Page 18. The Doctor supposeth a Question to be asked, on whom is, or on whose judgements the first Reformers relied in the weighty business? And answers it first negatively, "They had no respect of *Calvin*, whose offred assistance "they refused, when thy went about it, of which he sensibly "complains unto some of his Friends in one of his Epistles.

Here are three things affirmed, 1. That our first Reformers had no respect to *Calvin*. 2. That the Reformers refused his proffered assistance. 3. That *Calvin* sensibly complaineth of this in one of his Epistles. But the Historian is wiser than to tell us in what Epistle for number *Calvin* makes this complaint, or what was the name of that Friend to whom this Epistle was directed; such a reference might have spoiled his whole design, and discredited his future proceedings; for it would have let his Reader understand, that he could confidently over things, that were neither *vera*, nor *verisimilia*. Is any man so facil as to believe, that our first Reformers had no respect to *Calvin*, when as among the different opinions concerning the Sacrament they followed his; and sent for *Peter Martyr*, and *Martin Bucer*, and *Paul Fagius* (men that they might be sure he had influenced, and would influence) to assist them in carrying on their work, and to defend them by their learning against all opposition. I will once more look into *Calvin*'s Epistles and Answers, that I may see what thoughts our first Reformers had of the now so much decried man. One, and but one Epistle, I find written by *Cranmer* to *Calvin*, intimating his desire that learned and godly men, who excel others in learning and judgement, might meet in some safe place, where they might handle all the heads of Ecclesiastical Doctrine; and agree, not only as to the things themselves, but also as to words and forms of speaking. This his desire being signified, he intreateth *Calvin* that he and *Melancthon* and *Bulinger* would deliberate among themselves, how such a Synod might most commodiously be congregated. The Letter bears date *March* 20. 1552. *Calvin* from *Geneva* answers this Letter, approves the Arch-Bishops design of calling an Assembly of Divines, adds, that if there might be any use of him, he would not refuse to pass over ten

sea

seas to further it, but hoped that his tenuity would effect that he might be spared, he would think he had done his part if he should accompany others with his Prayers. This certainly is not proffering his service, and complaining that this service when proffered was refused. *Calvin* also did write to the Protector, the Duke of *Somerset*; that Letter was so kindly accepted, that he of his own accord offered to present another Letter, which *Calvin* sent to King *Edward* himself; but it may be this Letter to the King was not accepted? I answer, it was not only accepted by the King, but also pleased his whole Council. And *Cranmer* admonished *Calvin*, that he could not do any thing more profitable, than to write often to the King, as I find in a Letter to *Firel* from *Calvin*, dated *June* 15. 1557. *Bucer* at *Cambridge* understood that *Calvin*'s Letters prevailed much with *Somerset*, and therefore intreats him when he did write to him, to admonish him not to suffer the Churches to be left void of Preachers, and to be betrayed. Bishop *Hooper* so much valued *Calvin*, that he did write to him, even when he was imprisoned, suluting him by the Compellation of *Vir præstantissime*, earnestly begging his Churches prayers, and at last subscribing himself *Tuus pietatis studiosissimus* Jo. Hooperus. These things put together, make it impossible that our first Reformers had no respect to *Calvin*.

Let the Doctor now have leave to tell us, to whom or to what our Reformers had respect to (saith he) "The most pure "and sincere Christian Religion taught in the Scriptures, "and in the next place to the usages of the Primitive Church, *Ibid.*

This I grant, but must also add, that they had a respect unto the condition of the English People, much wedded to Superstition; and therefore they were feign to recommend to Authority for establishment, not every thing which they accounted best, but what they thought the weak People would be able to bear.

D. H.

"Being satisfied in this, they had a respect to the Luthe-"ran platforms, the English Confession, or Book of Ar-"ticles, being taken in many places word for word out of "that of *Ausberg*.

If

If this be true, that our Reformers had such an eye to the Augustan Confession. I infer, that seeing *Calvin* could, and did subscribe to the Augustan Confession, there is nothing in our Articles but what he might have subscribed to. But the present Lutherans will hardly be perswaded, that the Composers of our Articles had so tender a respect to the Confession of *Auxberg*, at least as now by them understood; for Ubiquity in the Article concerning the Lord's Supper, is plainly condemned, whiles it is defined, that the Body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places.

D. H.

"In reference to the Points disputed, they ascribe much to "the Authority of *Melancthon*, (not undeservedly called the "Phœnix of *Germany*) whose assistance they earnestly desired, "whose coming over they expected, who was as graciously "invited hither by King *Edward*. His coming laid aside on "the fall of the Duke of *Somerset*; therefore seeing they could "not have his company, they made use of his writings for "their directions.

Of this passage I am not able to give such an account as I desire; well I remember I have read, that *Melancthon*, in an Epistle to *Gomerarius*, mentions his being invited into *England* by King *Henry* the Eighth, about the years 1534. and the cause of his refusal to accept the invitation, *some intelligence he had received, that the King had no great care of the affairs of the Church.* That he was ever invited by King *Edward*, I can neither affirm nor deny, having not *Melancthon*'s Epistles at hand: But when was it that this great Scholar's assistance was so earnestly desired? The fall of the Duke of *Somerset* is placed by Mr. *Fox* at the 22. of *Jan.* 1552. the sixth year of the King's Reign, but a few moneths before the King's own death; he had indeed two years before lost his Protectorship, and so as to that may be said to be slain. Before either his fall as Duke of *Somerset*, or as Protector, *Peter Martyr*, and *Martin Bucer*, had been in *England*; now both these Worthies I shall prove to be Calvinistical in the Points under debate; and certainly the sending for two Calvinists, is a better and stronger Argument, that our first Reformers had a respect to *Calvin* in drawing up the Articles of Faith, than

then the sending for one *Melanchon* is, that they had an Anticalvinistical project; especially if it be considered that *Hieron Zanchy*, a Calvinist, if not more then a Calvinist, was also sent for over into *England*; and had come over to assist in carrying on the Reformation, if when he was just upon his journey, a call to another Church had not diverted him. Let me also ask, what writings of *Melanchon* be they that our Reformers had for their directory? The first Edition of *Melanchon*'s common places, approved by *Luther*, was written as Calvinistically to the matter of Predestination, as *Calvin* himself could desire. *Calvin*'s own Book against *Pighius* was approved by *Melanchon*, and indeed dedicated to him; if in any other writings he seems to contradict *Calvin* (he doth but seem) in these matters, it is to be imputed not to any contrariety in his own judgement, but to a contrariety in those mens tempers that he had to deal with; and there is even betwixt St. *James* and St. *Paul*, writing against contrary errors, such a seeming contrariety, as every man is not able to reconcile. Something there is in what *Lampadius* writes to the continuation of *Pezelius* his History, *page* 409. *Philippus rigidissime olim, si quisquam alius de prædestinatione scripsit in Loc. communibus, Anno* 1523. *Postea cum videret infirmos duris Lutheri phrasibus offendi & perduelles eas passim cippo affixas ad infamandum Evangelium traducere & calumniari, mitigavit sententiam suam; ut qui satis esse putaret, auditores deduci ad Christum, vitæ librum, & tanto magis fructus fidei deposceret, & urgeret*, viz. *concordiam & charitatem; neque tamen ob hanc sobrietatem ab Orthodoxis unquam est repudiatus aut condemnatus; neque ipse propterea à severioribus syntheticis alienior fuit, sed ad Bezam se per omnia cum Genevensibus Orthodoxis facere scribit.* No Church can be more Melanchthonian then the Church of *Breme*, it answering by *Pezelius* to the *Beschuldigung van Calvinischer* the accusation of Calvinism, hath these words translated: "We "and our Predecessors have alway so declared our selves, and "by this do again declare our selves, that as by the Magistrate "of this City we are called to the Function Ecclesiastical, to "teach according to the Prophetical and Apostolical Wri-"tings, the Catholick Symbols of Christian, the Augustan "Confession, the Apology, the *Franckford* Recess, and "the whole Body of the Doctrine of *Philip Melanchon*, so

 as we

"we have by the grace of God hitherto taught congruously "thereunto, and by none have been convinced by solid rea-"sons to teach any thing different therefrom; in which kind "of teaching, by the help of God, we have moreover de-"creed to persevere. Yet the three Divines of this Church did not refuse to subscribe the Canons of the Synod of *Dort*; so that in the opinion of these men, who seem to have studied the five Points as much as any, Melancthonism and Calvinism, are not irreconcilable: And if our first Reformers were regulated by *Melancthon*, they and the Calvinists may shake hands as good Friends.

Is there any one else that the Doctor thinks the first Reformers attributed much unto? Yes, one; viz. *Erasmus*, pag. 18, 19. of whom he tells us, that he was Greek Professor in *Cambridge*, which every one knows; as also that he is put in the Catalogue of the Lady *Margarets* Professors of Divinity in that University, but died 1536. and though it be true which the Doctor relates out of *Fox*, that by the Protector, in the first year of King *Edward*'s Reign, it was commanded, "That *Erasmus* his Paraphrases on the four "Evangelists should be set in some convenient place in "Churches, and that every Priest should have of his own "one new Testament in English and Latine, with the Pa-"raphrases of *Erasmus* on the same. Yet it doth not follow, as is inferred, that our Reformers intended not to advance any other Doctrine, than what was countenanced in the writings of that Learned man. This follows not; or if it do follow, then it follows much more from the Canon of our Convocation, 1571. that our Church never intended to propagate any Doctrine, but what had countenance in the martyrology of *Fox*; but that consequence the Doctor will at no hand, allow but sets himself against it *vivis viribus*, *part* 3. *p.* 59. see the difference, King *Edward*'s Council in the first year of his Reign, when the Church was scrace crept out of Popery (if crept out of Popery) placed *Erasmus* his Paraphrases in Churches; therefore the Church intended no Doctrine, but that which was countenanced in *Erasmus*. This is a good Argument, Queen *Elizabeth*, when Reformation was come to a great height, by the advice of her whole Convocation, placed Mr. *Fox* in Churches and Houses of great resort; therefore the Church intended no Doctrine, but what

what was countenanced in the writings of Mr. *Fox*: this is no good Argument, because the case is altered. But, I hope, the Doctor thinks that the Protector did intend to propagate some other Doctrine, then what was countenanced in the writings of *Erasmus*, why else did he go to fight against the Scots, which War was unlawful on the Principles of *Erasmus*? if the Protector warred against his conscience, yet, I trow, the Articles were not drawn up against the minds of those that formed them, yet in one of them War is justified. Yea, I heartily wish that the Article of the Trinity, were not against some Doctrine countenanced in the writings of this learned man *Erasmus*. The blot of Arrianism shall not fall on his face from my pen; but our new Arrians, the Socinians, do boast of him as their own, I hope not upon so good grounds as they may boast of *Hugo Grotius* his Countryman: But boast of him they do, the Ministers of *Transilvania*, in the most cursed Book of the *Knowledge of one God*, number him among their Ancestors: and *Socinus* himself in his Epistles, saith of him. *That he was not undeservedly suspected by the Trinitarians of Arminianism; and of the Antitrinitarians, reckoned among those who somewhat darkly renounced the Trinity.*

But now at last, that Dr. *Heylin* may say that he hath met with a very good natured man, I will give, but not yield, that *Erasmus* his Paraphrases were eyed by our first Reformers, in making their Confession of Faith; what will he gain thence? truly just nothing at all, or less then nothing; if nothing more be found in them then what is picked out, and set before us *pag.* 104, 110, 111. for in all those collections, there is not one phrase or sentence that doth contradict any one of the five Points, as stated by the rigidest Calvinists; even those who say, that Christ died only for the Elect (in which number I never put my self) will bring themselves from all and every thing that is here alledged out of *Erasmus*. Of universal Redemption, saith the Doctor, he tells us thus, This Lamb is so far from being subject to any sin, that he alone is able to take away all the sins of the whole World. Will *Amesius*, *Gomarus*, or any other that most restrains the death of Christ, deny this? do they not all distinguish betwixt the worth of the death, and the will of him that died? and say, that the worth of the death was such, that God might with-

out any indecency, have accepted it for the redemption of ten thousand Worlds, if there had been so many. *Erasmus* further adds, he is so gentle, and so desirous of mans salvation, that he is ready to suffer pains for the sins of all men, and to take upon him our evils, because he would bestow upon us his good things. This is so dilute a speech, that I will strengthen it, and say, that he did suffer pains for the sins of all men; and yet dare peremptorily aver, that no Gomarist would refuse to subscribe the saying; for he can grant, that Christ died with an intention to purchase some benefits for the very Reprobates; and he will further say, that for ought appears to the contrary, *Erasmus* might, by all men, mean the *genera singulorum*, and not the *singula generum*; for doubtless that phrase in Scripture, sometimes signifies no more, then men of all sorts, ages, Countries. I wish men would either not at all dispute for the amplitude of Redeeming grace, or else bring more apposite and concluding testimonies and authorities then any that the Doctor hath here brought. Ner is the Doctor more advantaged by any thing that he alledgeth out of the *Institution of a Christian*; for if the Reformation in *Henry* the Eighths time were looked on as a standard, (which it is not by any Protestant) yet is there not a tittle in all the five particulars gathered by him, *par.* 2. *pag.* 21, 22. that hath so much as a face of opposition to any opinion of Mr. *Calvin*'s concerning Predestination: Had the Authors of that part of the Institution put the Pen, after they had made it, into *Calvin*'s own hand, he would not have dashed out any one period or expression in it.

Many and just exceptions might be taken against sundry passages relating to the Compolers and composition of the first and second Book of Liturgy, and the Book of Homilies of King *Edward*, pag. 23, 24. but being a *prosdionysous* to our main Controversie, let them pass; nor will I wrestle with the Historian concerning any thing he saith about the Composers of the Articles, or the Articles themselves, or the authority they carry, in respect of the making, or how they are to be understood in respect of the meaning, from *page* 25. to *page* 33. though if I should wrestle, I were sure to lay him on his back. I will also submit to every Rule by him laid down, for the interpreting of the Article concerning Predestination, *page* 34.

Let

Let this be agreed on, 1. That that only is the Doctrine of our Church, which is laid down expresly in our Articles, or by good consequence may be thence deduced.

2. That if any phrase occur, about which there is any doubt, that be taken for the meaning, that shall be found agreeable to the mind of those who first composed, or were authorized to review the Articles, or were familiarly acquainted with such, and may be presumed to know their meaning, or to have received the notions from them.

3. Let this also be taken for granted, that none are to believe, or think themselves elect, but those who find in themselves a faith working by love; or that none can take unto themselves the comfort of being given to the Son by the Father's decree, but only those who are come unto him; and that no ones reprobation can be known by himself, or another in any ordinary way; unless by discerning some such sin as is alway accompanied with final unbelief and impenitence, (such is only the sin against the holy Ghost.) But the thing to be enquired, is, whether God's purpose to save out of fallen man all that believe, and persevere in believing, be his whole decree of Predestination? and his purpose to condemn all who continue in unbelief, the whole of his Reprobation? so say the Remonstrants; if our Church acknowledg no other decree of Election or Reprobation but this, Dr. *Heylin* then hath got the day; but if the Church, besides this general purpose, do acknowledg a decree, to give to a certain number of persons grace and glory, and a decree to leave others in that sin and misery that they brought on themselves by the fall, then he loseth the day.

But do the Remonstrants acknowledg no other Election and Reprobation besides these?

Answ. Sometimes they do not; and then all their Election notwithstanding no one man may be saved; but sometimes they are in a better mood, and give us notice of another Election, according to which some shall certainly be saved; this their decree is terminated to singular persons, but it is nothing else but God's purpose to save St. *James*, or St. *Clement*, (for example) whom he eternally foresaw persevering in faith unfeigned to the end of their lives; this latter decree they speak of but rarely (what our thoughts are of it, will be seen by and by) nor doth it honour Divine election at all,

for when they are closely examined, they say, the designation of St. *James* to salvation, was founded on the foresight of a faith, not which he attained unto by vertue of any grace prepared for him by Divine election, but which he attained unto by the good use of his own Free-will. Never do I find them, or any that follow them, acknowledg an Election of the Son of *Zebedee*, or any other person, unto Faith, or unto any other part of Holiness. Other Questions there be betwixt the Calvinist and Anticalvinist, besides the Question of Election, but such as are reduceable to it, or at least such about which they would easily agree, could they but agree in this, I for my part would only ask that angry man, who calls me Manichee, Blasphemer, *&c.* Why did *James* believe? why did he persevere? why was he ordained to eternal life? If in answering these, he fly to a special discriminating love and mercy, then will I never look on him as an Adversary; but if he shall say, the cause of all is to be referred to *James* his own using of such sufficient means as were vouchsafed to *Judas* as well as to him, then must I needs think, that he taketh from God to give to man; I must also needs think, that he shapeth his Notion of the Divine decree and grace, neither according to Scripture, nor according to the Doctrine of the Fathers who wrote against *Pelagius*, nor according to the English Church: As to our English Church, thus runs her Article, according to the Doctor, *page* 27. "Predestination to life, is the everlasting purpose of "God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were "laid) he hath constantly ordered by his Councel secret un-"to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom "he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring "them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to "honour.

"Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such "wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture, "and in our doing the will of God, that it be followed which "we have expresly declared to us in the Word of God.

One would think that the many words used in this Article, were sufficient to determine what kind of Predestination the Church meaneth; for if she had meant nothing but God's purpose to save all Believers, it had been but bringing some one Scripture, in which eternal life is promised to Believers, and

and all had been done. Nay, what needed any Article at all concerning Predestination and Election, when we had one before concerning Justification? which according to this Notion very little differs from Election, God's Justification considered as an internal immanent act in himself, was nothing but his purpose to justifie fallen man believing in Christ: How much Mr. *Playfer* is gravelled with this Argument, may be seen *App. Evan.* 360. 2. If election be nothing but God's purpose to save Believers, why is it said, that as many as are endued with so excellent a benefit of good, be called according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season, they through grace obey, and they walk religiously; and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity: the benefit that any man hath by Election in this way, is but to know, that if he believe, he shall be saved: And are all that know so much, called, justified, made to live righteously, and saved? we know they are not. Again, it is said, that the godly consideration of Election in Christ, is of unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ. But in the Doctor's way, Predestination is comfortable to those who feel nothing of the Spirit; for the promise is to them, that if they believe, they shall be saved; and other promise the godly man hath not, he may the next hour lose all his holiness, and what certainty hath he then of salvation? It is also said, that for curious and carnal persons, to have alway before them the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them into desperation, or into wretchlesness of living; but now for any men to have the Doctor's Election, or sentence of Predestination alway before them, is no way dangerous, or apt to beget either despair or wretchledness; we cannot advise carnal persons to a more profitable and pertinent object of meditation. In a word, the very calling of Election by the name of Predestination, is enough to determine what kind of Election is meant; the Doctor's Election is a Predestination; for it then only makes men ordained to eternal life, when having overcome all temptations, they are possessed of it.

But I must hear what the Historian hath to observe from this Article, *page* 35. 1. *That Predestination doth suppose a Curse, or state of Damnation, in which all mankind was re-*

presented to the sight of God, which plainly crosseth the opinion of the Supralapsarians. I have no fondness for the opinion of the Supralapsarians (though I honour the memory of some Supralapsarians) but yet cannot deem, that there is any thing in the Article that doth overthrow the Opinion; he that is of another mind, may do well to frame a Syllogism out of the Article, and to try his strength; and withal, he may do well to refute Mr. *Worton*, who hath so expounded the Article, as to draw the Supralapsarian platform out of it; and his Argument is not inconsiderable, *page* 137. Answer to *Montague*.

D. H. Ibid.

It is an act of his from everlasting, because from everlasting he foresaw into what misery wretched man would fall.

Our Article doth indeed call Predestination, the everlasting purpose of God; but that it therefore calls it so, because God foresaw what misery man would fall into, is to speak mildly an unproved dictate.

D. H. Ibid.

He founded it, and resolved for it in the Man and Mediator Christ Jesus, both for the purpose and performance, which crosseth as directly with the Sublapsarian.

The Article in describing those whom God hath predestinated, saith, *they are such whom he hath chosen in Christ*; therefore God founded Election, and resolved for it in the Man and Mediator Christ Jesus, both for the purpose and performance; this is an Argument that hath scarce sense in it, so far is it from having any strength of reason.

But how doth this cross with Sublapsarians? *Why, because they place the absolute Decree of Predestination to Life, and of Reprobation unto Death, both of Body and Soul, before the decree or consideration of sending his only beloved Son into the World, to be the common Propitiation for the Sins of Men.*

This may perhaps be true of some Sublapsarians, of all I am sure it is not; the Sublapsarians I converse with, say, that if we respect God's nature and perfection, he doth by one most simple act, and at once, decree all things; but if respect be had to the things decreed, some priority and posteriority

riority hath place. They also say, that the Controversie betwixt them and the Arminians, is not concerning the order of the Divine decrees, (which almost every considerable Author hath framed with some variety) would the Remonstrants but acknowledg, that God did by his decree ordain men to Faith, as well as to eternal life, they would permit them to abound in their own sense, whether he did first ordain to the means, or to the end. Christ is by all Sublapsarians, that I ever heard of, made the meritorious cause of our Salvation; but they say, he is not the impulsive cause, why one rather then another is chosen to Eternal life, any more then he was the cause of sending himself into the World. Whether the consideration of the Mediator did in God's decree precede the consideration of Salvation to be obtained by him, or the Salvation appointed to the Elect precede the consideration of the Mediator, is a thing disputed among the Calvinists themselves.

D. H. Ibid.

That it was of some special ones alone, and not generally extended unto all mankind, a general election, as they say, being no election.

This is a great truth, that Election cannot be of all, a general election being *oppositum in opposito*, but the Doctor would have merited much of the Arminians, if he had shewn us what Election they acknowledge, which is not of all. *Arminius* makes four Decrees: 1. The Decree to send Christ to Redeem mankind. 2. The Decree to give Eternal life to Believers. 3. The Decree to give Grace and Strength sufficient to Believe. 4. The Decree to give Salvation to those particular Persons whom he foresaw would Believe, and persevere in the Faith. The three first concern all, or at least all that hear of Christ; as for the fourth, methinks it is not worth the name of a Decree, nor beseeming the Divine Wisdom; for if our King foreknowing who would come in and acknowledg their Rebellion, should decree that all comers in, &c. should be pardoned; would it be suitable to Royal Wisdom to make another decree, to pardon those whom he foresaw would come in, &c. Besides, this fourth Decree can be of no use or efficacy to any man in this life; it conferred no more benefit to *David* then to *Saul*,

to

to *Abel* then to *Cain*; for this Decree supposeth perseverance in Faith to the last breath, and so belongs to the other world: Now let all Christians judge, whether the Scriptures describe not such an Election, as hath its efficacy and fruit in this life.

D. H. Ibid.

That being thus elected in Christ, they shall be brought by Christ (but not without their own consent and co-operation) to everlasting salvation.

The Historian would do well to ponder, whether Infants be not brought to eternal salvation, without their own consent or co-operation? whether they are all placed among the Elect? St. *Austin* was wont to urge such an Argument against the Adversaries of absolute Election, and it gravelled them; the Doctor dealt wisely to take no notice of it: Of adult Persons his observation may be granted.

D. H. Ibid.

That this Counsel is secret unto us; for though here be revealed some hopeful signs of our Election unto life, yet the certainty of it is a secret hidden in God, and in this life unknown unto us.

The Doctor should have said, if he would have kept to the words of the Article, that God hath ordered by his Counsel secret to us; the meaning whereof seems to be, that the reason which moved God to predestinate this or that person, is unknown to us: But this would have overthrown the whole Arminian fabrick; therefore another sense is pitched on, no way deduceable from the phrase, contrary to Scripture, contrary to the sense and judgment of our Martyrs and Confessors; *viz.* that in this life we can have no certainty of our predestination unto life.

Against this, thus I argue: If a man may certainly know that he believes in Christ, he may know certainly, that he is predestinated unto eternal life. But the antecedent is true, *ergo* so is the consequent.

I prove my major, because every one that believes, is ordained to eternal life; which enunciation, if any one shall deny; I prove it, first, by the saying of Mr. *Latimer*, quoted with applause by the Doctor, *If thou believest in him, then*

art

are thou written in the Book of life, and shalt be saved; which connexion were not good, if there were any man, a Believer, whose name were not found in the Book of life, or not saved. I prove it, because Faith is called, the Faith of God's Elect, *Tit.* 1. 1. I prove it finally, because it is said, that *as many as were ordained to eternal life believed*, *Acts* 13. 48. Why is it said, as many as were ordained to eternal life believed, if any could believe but those who are ordained to eternal life: But there is a place not to be eluded, *Whom he calleth, those he justifieth; and whom he justifieth, those he also glorifieth.* Whoever are called according to the purpose of his will, are justified and glorified.

As to the minor, that a man may certainly know he hath faith, methinks no Christian should doubt it; we should not so earnestly be pressed to try, whether we be in the faith, if we could not know, whether we be so or no: Are there not some effects that are proper to saving faith? if there be, why may not he who feels them in himself, conclude thence that he hath faith.

As for our first Reformers, so far were they from thinking that Election is not knowable, that some of them placed Faith in an assurance of a mans Election, and Christ's dying for him; if I prove this, I shall prove *ex abundanti*, that they were for personal absolute Election: Of others I shall prove, that they have in terms express owned *Calvin*'s Predestination, or some such Doctrine as is necessarily connexed with it. Secondly, I shall answer every Testimony that Dr. *Heylin* brings to prove, that the absolute Decrees were decryed by any of our Martyrs, and pass to the other Points.

I begin with the Liturgy in the Catechism, whereof after rehearsing of the Creed, question is made,

What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy belief?

Answer returned is,

1. *I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the world.*

2. *In God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind.*

3. *In God the holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God.*

The object of the Father's Creation, is here made the Respondent, and all the World; the object of the Son's Redemption, is the Respondent, and all Mankind; the object

of

of the Spirits Sanctification, is the Respondent, and all the Elect People of God. The second object is not so large as the first, nor the third so large as the second; and the *Catechumen* is as well taught to number himself among the Elect people of God, as among mankind. Who are these chosen of God? surely they are the Elect according to the foreknowledg of God the Father; and so such is the Sanctification of the Spirit here limited: So that if any one be chosen, he is sanctified; and if he be sanctified, he is chosen; and every one who comes for Confirmation, is taught to profess himself one of those whom the Spirit Sanctifieth, and God Elected. I dare not direct every Baptized person so to say, but by this we may see, what the opinion of the Composers of the Liturgy was.

In the Catechism appointed by King *Edward*'s Authority to be taught by all Schoolmasters. *Fol.* 38. it is said, *To the furnishing of this Commonweal belong all they, as many as do truly fear, honour, and call upon God, wholly applying their mind to holy and godly living; and all those, that putting all their hope and trust in him, do assuredly look for the Bliss of everlasting life: But as many as are in this faith stedfast, were forechosen, predestinate, and appointed out to everlasting life, before the world was made: Witness whereof they have within their hearts, the Spirit of Christ the Author, earnest unfailable, and pledge of their faith.* How much Calvinism is here? as many as fear God, were forechosen, predestinate and appointed out to everlasting life before the world was made; therefore if any man fail or miss of eternal life, he never feared God; or God never put his fear into any, but those whom he so foreordained to everlasting life. Yet there is more, *fol.* 39. *The first principal and most perfect cause of our justifying and salvation, is the goodness and love of God, whereby he chose us for his before he made the world.* Now the Arminian election is not sure the most perfect cause of our justifying and salvation; nor is it God's chusing of us to be his before he made the world: And let it be observed, that it is said, that after that he hath chosen us for his, he granteth us to be called by the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, when the spirit of the Lord is poured into us.

Our next task is to look into the sentiments of our Martyrs and Confessors, such as lost their lives, or left their Coun-

try, or were deprived of their Liberty, or Dignities and Preferments, for bearing witness to the Doctrine that was established by all Authority, Ecclesiastical and Civil, among us. Our first Martyr in order of time was *John Rogers*; our first in order of Dignity, were *Cranmer* of *Canterbury*, and *Ridley* of *London*, Bishops: I have not met with any writings of either of these, in which they have expresly declared their judgments in the Points under debate; yet we will see what may be at least guessed concerning their mind. For Mr. *Rogers*, I find he was the Convert of *William Tindal*, and *Miles Coverdale*, and that he joyned with them in making that Translation, which now goes by the name of *Matthews* Translation; and what opinions that Translation doth favour, I leave it to indifferent persons to judge. I find him also among those worthy Persons, who subscribed a declaration sent abroad *May* 8. 1554. all whose names are to be seen in Mr. *Fox* his third Volume, *page* 102. of the *London* Edition, 1631. (which Edition I shall still follow, having not the last Edition by me) the purport of that Declaration, is to shew Reasons why they will not otherwise dispute, then before indifferent Judges. In the Declaration also is couched a Confession of their Faith, worthy to be read by all who would understand the spirit of our Martyrs aright. The fourth branch of that Declaration, is concerning Justification by Faith only; of which having delivered their mind, they add in the close, *By this we disallow Papistical Doctrine, of Free-will, of Works of Supererrogation, of Merits, of the Necessity of Auricular Confession and Satisfaction to God-wards.* If they disallowed the Papistical Doctrine of Free-will, whose Doctrine did they allow, but the Doctrine of *Calvin* and *Luther*? who in this matter perfectly agreed (*Luther*'s high flown expression being abated.)

All that I shall more observe concerning this Mr. *Rogers*, is 1. That he was a Non-conformist even to excess, (his zeal out-running knowledg, unless he had some reasons proper to those times) for he never went otherwise then with a round Cap; and would not agree to use the Attire proper to the Order of Priesthood, unless the Popish Priests might be enjoyned to wear upon the sleeves, a Chalice with an Host.

2. That he was very zealous to put to death the two Heretick condemned by Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*, and burnt

1550,

1550, 1551. a familiar Friend of his came to him, and desired him to make use of his interest with *Cranmer*, *that they might not be put to death; or if they were put to death, that they might not be burnt; because that kind of death seemed not so agreeable to Evangelical meekness.* He answered, *That the punishment of burning men alive was not so tormenting, but mild enough.* His Friend replied, with a great ardor of spirit, holding his right hand, and striking his own against it, *Go too, perhaps it will come to pass, that your selves may have your hands full of so mild burning.* And he was indeed (as I before suggested) the first that tasted of the Marian Meekness.

A. B. *Cranmer* must needs be supposed to have a great stroke in the framing of the Articles of Religion agreed on 1552. so must Bishop *Ridley* also; for though *Cranmer* was Metropolitan in Title, yet *Ridley* seems to be the greater Stickler of the two, especially in the matter of Rites and Ceremonies; he forced *Hooper* to be Canonically Ordained, against his inclination, against the King's Letter, and the Earl of *Warwick*'s Letter, the one bearing date *July* 23. 1550. the other *August* 5. yea, so violent was he, that he threatned, or caused to be threatned death to *Hooper*, if he persisted in refusal. *Hac Theologomachia sic tandem exiit vincentibus Episcopis*, Hooperus *vel ad palinodiam, vel ad eas conditiones ad actus est, ut semel saltem in concione publicè se ostenderet populo more cæterorum Episcoporum infulatus. Quod inserisset sunt qui putant Episcopos ultimorum supplicium ei molituros; nam ita audivi à famulo ipsius, Ducem* Suffolciam *clam* Hooperum, *qui eorum conatus non ignorabat, monuisse.* *Fox* in his Latine Commentary, *page* 280. I much wonder what stirred up this heat in *Ridley*, and much doubt, it was some personal pique against *Hooper*, because of his popularity and boldness in reproving the manners of the time, and the corruptions of the Church; marvelously was *Hooper* flocked after. *Sæpe adfui* (saith *Fox*) *quum in templi fores nemo ingredi, concionante* Hoopero *poluerit, tanta ejus diligentia fuit, ut nullum diem sine binis, aut ternis quandoque concionibus præterire. Rursus ea in Scripturis promptitudo, ut si sexies ei faciendum esset, tempore citius quam materia eguisset, pag.* 279. I say, I doubt there was somewhat of a pique, because I find that the same *Ridley* did ordain *John Bradford* a Deacon, without any of those Canonical Rites that were then in use, as appeareth Acts and Monuments,

ments, *page* 280. but *Ridley* acknowledged his fault, and God forgave him, and so must man too. In the Letter in which this acknowledgment is made, he also acquaints *Hooper*, that he understood by his works, which he had superficially seen, *that they throughly agreed, and wholly consented in those things, which are the grounds and substantial points of our Religion, against which the world so furiously raged in those days*: by which works, in all probability, he means some Treatises *Hooper* composed against Transubstantiation, which are exemplified in *Fox* his Latine Commentary. Certain it is, that *Ridley* could not approve all Doctrines in *Hooper*'s works, unless he disapproved one Article of our Religion: For *Hooper* in his Commentary on the Creed, doth most expressly declare against the local descent of Christ into Hell; which is asserted as a truth grounded on Scripture in the Articles of Religion: And as certain is it, that *Ridley* could not joyn with him, if he condemned the absolute decree of Election (I shall shew hereafter that he did not) or determinating grace in conversion. The Article of Election, I have already both transcribed and argued from; let us now see what may be collected from the Articles of Free-will and Grace, which I will present as they were Printed by *John Day*, with the King's Authority, 1553.

We have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working in us when we have that will.

The Grace of Christ, or the holy Ghost by him given, doth take away the stony heart, and giveth an heart of flesh: And although those that have no will to good things, he maketh them to will; and those that would evil things, he maketh them not to will the same; yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will; And therefore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself, as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alledging that he sinneth unwillingly, or by compulsion.

If this be not Calvinism and Antiarminianism, I know not what is; all power to good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without grace preventing and co-operating, is denied to us. Grace also is said to take away the stony heart, and give an heart of flesh; to make us to will (not only able to will) good things: And when it comes to be explained what it doth not,

it

it is only said, it enforceth not; and sinners are only said, not to act by compulsion, which may well consist with some necessity. This is the sum of what the Calvinists alledg, when charged to destroy Free-will; but now the Arminians say, there is no liberty, where no indifference; and that the grace of God leaves a man indifferent, to turn or not to turn. I shall conclude what relates to Bishop *Ridley*, with those words of his farewel, *page* 506. *Acts and Monu. The Church had holy and wholesome Homilies*, &c. *it had in matters of controversie Articles so penned and framed after the holy Scripture, and grounded upon the true understanding of God's Word, that in short time, if they had been universally received, they should have been able to have set in Christ's Church much concord, and unity in Christ's true Religion; and to have expelled many false Errors and Heresies, wherewith this Church, alas, was almost overgone.*

He here approves all the Articles, and therefore the three before mentioned, as agreeable to God's Word.

As to *Cranmer*, we have him not only owning all the Doctrine and Religion set out by King *Edward*, but also offering (if *Peter Martyr* might be joyned to him, with four or five more) to maintain that it was more pure, and according to God's Word, then any that had been used in *England* for an hundred years. This had been a most foolish challenge indeed, if he had not known full well, that *Peter Martyr* and he jumped in their judgments about all the Articles; and particularly that of Predestination with Heterodoxy, in which he might well expect to be charged; for *James Lambert* had been opposed in that point in King *Henry* the Eighths Reign; and our Martyrs in Queen *Mary*'s time, were frequently twitted with fatality, making God the Author of Sin, destroying Free-will, and what not?

The next Martyr I shall instance in, is Mr. *Philpot*, to whom Mr. *Bradford* refers his Friend for satisfaction in the matter of Election. What he did write about Election, I do not find; but I find enough to make me confident, that if he had written any thing about it, he would have shewed himself sufficiently Calvinistical: For in his fifth Examination, he took occasion to ask his Popish Adversaries, *which of them all was able to Answer* Calvin's *Institutions, which is Minister of* Geneva? To which Dr. *Saverson* replies, with lye and all, *A*

godly

godly Minister indeed of receipt of Cut-purses, and Runnagate Traytors. And of late, I can tell you, there is such contention fallen between him and his own Sects, that he was feign to flee the Town, about Predestination; I tell you truth, for I came by Geneva *hither.* At which calumny *Philpot*'s zeal was stirred, as appears by his words; *I am sure you blasphème that godly man, and that godly Church where he is Minister; as it is your Churches condition, when you cannot answer men by learning, to oppress them with blasphemies and false reports; for in the matter of Predestination, he is in none other opinion then all the Doctors of the Church be, agreeing to the Scriptures.* If this be not full and home, what is? The profound Disputant, and blessed Martyr, answering for his life, avows Mr. *Calvin*'s Doctrine of Predestination, to be agreeable to the ancient Doctors, and Scriptures; and how could a Doctrine be more amply commended?

His Friend Mr. *Bradford* will say as much for the Doctrine it self, though not taking notice of Mr. *Calvin* as delivering it in his Institutions. There is a Letter of his concerning Election to two of his Friends, *N. S. R. C.* recorded *Acts and Mon.* 352. who the persons were notified by these four letters, *N. S. R. C.* I have no certainty, but suppose that *N. S.* was one *Skelthrop*, who held conditional Election, and Free-will, but by the pains Mr. *Bradford* and others took with him, was reclaimed. After this Epistle of Mr. *Bradford*'s, Mr. *Fox* adds some Notes appertaining to the matter of Election, which Notes do not in the least contradict any one title in Mr. *Bradford*, but more largely explain what he touched but briefly. But Dr. *Heylin* saith, *Fox* his Notes corrupt the Text, and that Bradford's *Notion of Predestination, is plainly cross to that of the Calvinistical Party*, page 42. Let us see whether there be any such crosness or no. "*Bradford* (saith he) believeth "that Faith is the work and gift of God, given to none other "then the Children of God: Who are they? Those whom "God the Father, before the beginning of the World, hath "Predestinated in Christ unto Eternal life. Is this Election cross to that of the Calvinists? do not they say, against the Arminians, that Faith flows from Election as a fruit of it, and that it is commensurate with Election; so as none believe, but those who are elected. Is not this the very offensive Notion of Election, against which the Remonstrants make such out-

cries? The Letter further adds, that though Election be first in God, yet to us it is last opened; but the Doctor's Election is last in God, as well as last opened to us. Let the Martyr proceed in his Letter: "By the light of the Spirit, a "man may see this Faith not given to all men, but to such as "are born of God, predestinate before the World was made, "after the purpose and good will of God; which will, we may "not call into disputation, but in trembling and fear submit "our selves to it, as to that which can will none otherwise, "then that which is holy, right and good; how far soever "otherwise it seem to the judgment of reason, which must "needs be beaten down to be more careful for God's glory "then mans salvation, which dependeth only thereon, as all "God's Children full well see. Lo, here he speaks of a Predestination, in which there is an unsearchable depth of an Election, about which if reason, not assisted by revelation, should pass a judgment, there would seem to be in it something of injustice; whereas the Arminian Election, making God to predestinate men to life, upon the foresight that they would believe, and to pass by others, upon a foresight they would not believe, hath nothing of a depth in it, but is as easily accounted for, as any other act of God's providence whatsoever.

I said before, that I conceived one of those, unto whom this Letter is directed, was by it rectified in his judgment touching Election, and the use of Free-will, which he had made a condition of that Election; at least I am sure, one *Skelthop* was made to see the light in this particular. Mr. *Bradford* takes notice of the change wrought in him, and praises God for it, in a Letter to *Careless*, page 336. "Not doubt-"ing but that he would be so heedy in his conversation, that "his old Acquaintance may ever thereby think themselves "astray. In the same Letter he salutes in Christ *True*, and his Followers, hoping that God had his time for them also. "Now this *True* was a man differing from *Careless* in the point "of Election, as doth most manifestly appear by the Exami-"nation of *Careless*, related by the Doctor, *pag.* 15, 16. "*part* 3. He thought as the Popish Clergy did, that we be "elect in respect of our good works; but Mr. *Bradford* hoped "he would come off from that opinion; but I think he did "not, but still continued to sacrifice unto Free-will; and

"the

the Protestant cause was not credited by him, for he plaid such a pranck, as any ingenuous Heathen would have been ashamed; his Keeper shewing him more favor then he deserved, he ran away from him, and brought him into great danger. *Thus you may see* (says *Careless*) *the fruits of our Free-will-men, that make so much boast of their own strength; but that house which is not builded surely upon the unmoveable rock, will not long stand against the boisterous winds and storms, that blow so strongly in these days of troubles.* This is the only Sufferer I know of, that held conditional Election; and surely his carriage was not so commendable, that we should envy him unto our Adversaries, But whereas the Doctor thinks, that the strong confidence which *Careless* had of his own salvation, and of the final perseverance of all those who are the chosen Members of Christ's Church, was a thought of his own; unto which the Doctrine of the Church gave no countenance, it will appear, that this was no singular opinion of his, but a kindly derivation from the Article of Religion, concerning Predestination unto Life; and it seems to be that which he had learned from holy *Bradford*, who in a Letter to Mistress *M.H.* under great heavinesse and sorrow, teacheth her, "That "we should use all God's benefits to confirm our faith of this, "that God is our God and Father; and to assure us, that he "loveth us as our Father in Christ; and that God requireth "this faith, and fatherly perswasion of his fatherly goodness, "as his chiefest service: Adding, that no suggestion of Satan, "grounded upon our imperfection, frailty, and many evils, "should make us doubt of God's favor in Christ; and that "obedience giveth us not to be God's children, but to be "God's children giveth obedience. And finally, that as "certain as God is Almighty, as certain as God is merciful, "as certain as God is true, as certain as Jesus Christ was "crucified, is risen, and sitteth at the right hand of the "Father, as certain as this is God's Commandment, *I am "the Lord thy God*; so certain she ought to be, that God was "her Father, *pag.* 327, 328. "To another Gentlewoman, "*page* 330. thus he writes, if he had not chosen you (as most "certainly he hath) he would not have so called you; he "would never have justified you, he would never have so "exercised your faith with temptations as he hath done, and "doth, if (I say) he had not chosen you; if he have chosen

"you (as doubtless, Dear heart, he hath done in Christ.)
"for in you I have seen his earnest, and before me, and to
"me they could not deny it, I know both where and when;
"if, I say, he hath chosen you, then neither can you, nor
"ever shall perish. And in the same Letter, *page* 331. he
"says, Your thankfulness and worthiness are fruits and ef-
"fects of your Election, they are no causes; if once you had
"a hope in the Lord (as you doubtless had it) though now
"you feel it not, yet shall you feel it again; for the anger
"of the Lord lasteth but a moment, his mercy endureth for
"ever. In another Letter, *page* 349. the same blessed Mar-
"tyr says, that one man which is regenerate, well may be
"called always just, and always sinful; just in respect of
"God's seed, and his regeneration; sinful in respect of Sa-
"tan's seed, and his first birth; betwixt these two men there
"is continual conflict, and war most deadly; the flesh and
"old man, by reason of his birth that is perfect, doth often,
"for a time, prevail against the new man, being but a child
"in comparison; and that in such sort, as not only other,
"but even the Children of God themselves, think they be
"nothing else but old, and that the spirit and seed of God is
"lost and gone away; where yet notwithstanding, the truth
"is otherwise, the spirit and seed of God appearing again,
"and dispelling away the clouds which covet the sun of God's
"seed from shining, as the clouds in the air do the corporal
"Sun. Many things to like purpose follow in that Letter,
by all which, and by several Treatises in the Printed Works
of Mr. *Bradford*, it sufficiently appears, that he favoured
the Doctrine of absolute Predestination. And let any man
judg, whether he thought the term of a mans life to be move-
able or no, by some passages in his Examination, *page* 286.
"As for my death (my Lord) there are twelve hours in the
"day, (as I know) so with the Lord my time is appointed,
"and when it shall be his good time, then shall I depart
"hence; but in the mean season I am safe enough, though
"all the People had sworn my death. *Page* 291. he desires
"them to proceed on in God's name, he looked for that which
"God had appointed them to do. Upon which the Chan-
"cellor lets fall these words; This Fellow is inanother He-
"resie of Faith and necessity, as though all things were so
"tied together, that of meer necessity all must come to pass.
"What

"What replies *Bradford*? Things are not by fortune to God "at any time, though to man they seem so sometimes; I "speak but as the Apostle said, Lord, see how *Herod* and "*Pontius Pilate*, with the Prelates, are gathered together "against thy Christ, to do that which thy hand and counsel "hath before ordained for them to do.

Consider we next the judgment of *Peter Martyr* and *Martin Bucer*, who, though Foreigners, had a great hand in the English Reformation. As to *Peter Martyr*, methinks there should be no question made of his judgment; in his Commentary on the *Romans*, and in his common places, he hath gone as high in the matter of God's decree, as ever *Calvin* did. But the Doctor tells us, *part* 2. *page* 100. *That its more then probable that* Peter Martyr, *was not* Peter Martyr *whilest he lived in* England. If he would prove it but probable, he must prove that it hath seemed so to all, or to the most, or to the wisest, or to the most famous among those that are wise; which I despair of ever seeing him prove, so far am I from thinking, that he will prove more then this. The *London* Edition of his Common places is not now in many mens hands, yet it is to be found in *England* and elsewhere, and never did any one that was a possessor of it, so much as adventure to affirm, that in that Edition, any thing was delivered concerning Predestination, that was in the least contrary, or seemingly contrary to what we find in the Editions more commonly used: This answer the Doctor himself was somewhat diffident of, and therefore did not give it until that he had before *page* 109. made way by disparaging *Peter Martyr*, "As one of whom there was little use made in advising, and "much less in directing any thing which concerned the Ar-"ticles, as one who had no authority in Church or State, "as one that could not be considered as a Master-builder. Is the Doctor of the Chair of no authority in Church or State? I had thought that in matters Divine, both Ecclesiastical and Political Persons had been wont to give much to his authority. Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* it is most certain made much use of him, keeping him at his own house at his first coming over into *England*, that he might have the more frequent and free converse with him. And if Bishop *Ridley* was first converted to be a Protestant by reading of *Bertram*, yet it will not be denied that he owned his confirmation to dis-

course with *Peter Martyr*; as for the Convocation 1552. he might be, for ought I know, a member of it; doubtless he was one of the eight appointed by the King to make reformation of the Laws Ecclesiastical.

Concerning *Bucer* the Doctor would bear us in hand, that we have no reason to reckon him ours in the points under debate, because he well approved our first Liturgy, of which reason it will then be time enough to consider, when it shall be shewed, that that Liturgy had any thing in it that favored conditional Election, and superable converting Grace, and total and final Apostasie: But it is also affirmed, that he, among some other Protestants, assented in the point of falling from grace to the opinion of the Church of *Rome*, in the Diet at *Ratisbon*. 'Tis indeed affirmed by Mr. *Mountague* (and that I know, if by none else) that *Bucer* did at the Diet of *Ratisbone*, consent with some other Protestants to the possibility of the Saints falling from grace; but *Zanchy* tells us quite another tale, that *Bucer* hath in the relation of the Conference at *Ratisbon*, laid down that which makes strongly for the certain perseverance of the Saints; if Mr. *Mountague* had expected belief, he should have answered those allegations, and brought others that might evince the possibility of the true Saints apostasie. This may be sufficient to prove, that he was not against us, that he was for us; *Zanchy*'s quotations out of him will scarce suffer any one to doubt; but we will see whether we can find out any other evidence. First, whilst he was a Papist, he had his conversation among the Dominicans, from whom it is likely he got nothing agreeable to the Jesuits notion of respective Decrees, and frustrable grace; the Star that brought him out of Popery, was *Luther*'s Book *de servo Arbitrio*, by which Star it is not like that he was lead to Pelagianism, or Semipelagianism, or any other Doctrine that so advanceth the liberty of mans will, as sacrilegiously to rob the grace of God of its due force and power in the converting of a Sinner. What Doctrine he preached or delivered in the Schools whilst in *England*, may be collected from the barbarous malice of his Romish Adversaries appointing in his dead bones to be take nout of the grave, and committed unto the fire; for Dr. *Watson* in his Sermon in St. *Mary*'s, "Charges *Bucer* to have defended that perillous "Doctrine concerning the fatal and absolute necessity of Pre-

"desti-

"destination, and that he had set it out in such wise, as to "leave no choice at all in such things; as who should say, it "skilled not what a man purposed of any matter, since he had "not the power to determine otherwise then the matter should "come to pass; the which was the peculiar opinion of them "that made God the Author of Evil; bringing men through "this perswasion into such a careless security of the everlast-"ing eternity, that in the mean season it made no matter, "either towards salvation, or toward damnation, what a "man did in this life; and because it may be replied, that he "speaks this to disgrace and disparage Protestants in general. Let us therefore hear what Dr. *Perne* in his Sermon says concerning *Bucer*; in it we are told, "That he held opinion, "that God was the Author and well-spring, not only of "good, but also of evil; and that whatsoever was of that "sort flowed from him, as from the head-spring and maker "thereof; adding, that *Bucer* upheld this Doctrine to be "sincere; howbeit, for offending divers mens consciences, "he durst not put it into mens heads: And in his sentence "of condemnation, this is laid to his charge, as a Doctrine "defended by him, *omnia fato & absoluta necessitate fieri. vid.* Mr. *Fox*, *page* 770, 772. I know the good mans soul abhorred the things in these particulars charged upon him; nor did Dr. *Perne* stick to acknowledg, that he wronged him against his own conscience; yet seeing these Popish Agents can scarce be supposed so mad and furious, as to charge things upon him without any colour, we may and must suppose that *Bucer* did, if not in his publick determinations, yet in his private discourses let the University know, that his judgment did not differ from *Calvin*'s, in the matter of God's decrees and concurrence unto the sinful actions of men: But if so, "Why then does *Calvin* himself blame *Bucer*, for being Au-"ther and approver of such moderate courses, as the fiery "temper of the Calvinists could by no means like. [These are the Doctor's words, *page* 109.]

I answer, that *Bucer*, by his very best Friends, had been charged at *Zurick*, *Anno* 1533. for speaking too doubtfully in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, through a desire to appease *Luther*; he then and there made such an Apology for himself as was accepted: If at his coming over into *England*, he fell into the same fault, Mr. *Calvin* did but the part of a

Christian to admonish him; but certainly *Calvin* had high and honorable thoughts of him while he lived, and after his death tells *Viret*, *that he found his heart torn in pieces, as oft as he remembred how manifold a loss the Church of God sustained by his departure.* And so we leave *Bucer* and *Martyr*, with the *Elogium* deservedly bestowed upon them by Dr. *Jackson*, *The two judicious Commentators*, &c.

It is also worth while to enquire after the many worthy Divines, who to save their lives, and yet keep that faith and conscience which they had professed in the days of King *Edward*, did fly beyond Seas; we find some differences among them relating to Discipline and Ceremonies, an account whereof is given us in the troubles of *Frankeford*, had they not all been of one mind in matters of Doctrine relating to the Decree, Grace, and Perseverance, their difference had not been concealed, it had been easie for the party that sided with *Calvin* in these points, to have crushed the Anticalvinistical party, if any such there had been; but there is not the least ground to think there was any such. Those English Divines who sojourned at *Geneva* made a Translation of the Bible, and marginal Annotations upon it sufficiently Calvinistical, this was published *Anno* 1560. and the Authors of it were so little conscious to themselves of having delivered any Doctrine contrary to that which was received and allowed in King *Edward*'s time, that they adventured to dedicate their Work to the incomparable Princess Queen *Elizabeth*, no favorer of Foreign Doctrine. She accepted the Dedication, suffered the Book and the Annotations to pass among her People, without any censure here: So much entertainment and applause did it meet with, that some who have been curious to search into the number of its Editions, say, that by the Queens own Printers, it was printed above thirty times. I am not ignorant that King *James* highly censured this Translation, and the marginal Annotations in the *Hampton* Conference; the Translation he calls the worst that ever he saw; some of the Notes he calls very partial, untrue, seditious, and savoring too much of dangerous and traiterous conceits, instancing in the note on *Exod.* 1. 19. and 2 *Chron.* 15. 16. (which censure a Jesuit takes as if spoken of the Translation used at *Geneva* it self) but the Annotations on both these places are satisfied for by Bishop *Morton*, *page* 104. of a Book written

written by him to shew the Romanists Doctrine of Rebellion and Æquivocation. As for Arminianism charged on these Annotations by Dr. *H.* they are acquitted by the learned Letter of Sir *Thomas Bodley*..

I have all this while said nothing of Bishop *Hooper* and Bishop *Latimer*, out of whose writings the Doctor hath transcribed so much, and truly the things transcribed out of them are so impertinent, that it would be no hazard to my Reader if I should wholly pass them over in silence, yet I will not; but first shall say something of the men, secondly of their writings. *Latimer* was once a very hot Papist, as himself acknowledgeth against himself; being converted from Popery, he was as zealous for the Reformed Religion, boldly reproving the sins of all, whether Rulers or Ruled. In his Sermons he used a style, which perhaps was then accounted elegant; but would now be adjudged ridiculous, at least unbeseeming the Pulpit. *Hooper* I look upon as one that feared the Lord from his youth; for he chose from his youth to leave *Oxford*, that he might not ensnare his conscience. Beyond the Seas he fell into acquaintance with the learned *Henry Bullinger*; and returned not into *England* till the Reign of King *Edward*; when he gained more love from the Laicks then Clergy, being a stiff Non-conformist. Hand in drawing up the Articles of Religion he had none, one of them being diametrically opposite to his declared judgment; yet because he was very great, both for piety and learning, as his writings evidently shew, therefore his judgment is not to be sleighted. And if Dr. *Heylin* have proved, or any one else can prove, that he and *Latimer* held the opinions afterwards called Arminian; I will grant that these opinions were not by the Protestant Church in King *Edward*'s time adjudged intolerable. Whether they held them or no, must be considered: First, I yield that they both asserted Universal Redemption; this being granted, the Doctor dare say, *part 2. page 50, that he* (Mr. *Hickman* he means) *will not be confident in affirming there can be any room for such an absolute Decree of Reprobation antecedaneous, and precedent to the death of Christ, as his great Masters in the School of* Calvin *have been pleased to teach him.* Mr. *Hickman*'s mind is best known to himself, so are his great Masters in the School of *Calvin*, if he ever had any such; but this I am confident of, that *Calvin*'s Decree of Repro-

Reprobation may be maintained, and yet Universal Redemption not denied. Monsieur *Amyrald*, as great a Scholar as this late age hath afforded, hath in a whole Book defended *Calvin*'s absolute Decree against Mr. *Hord*; yet the same *Amyrald* most strenuously defends Universal Redemption.

Two Dissertations of Bishop *Davenant* are published by careful and faithful hands since his death; in the first, he sets himself to assert Universal Redemption by Christ; in the second, to assert Personal, both Election and Reprobation.

Let us see now what the Doctor can find in *Latimer* and *Hooper*. *Latimer* in his Sermon on *Septuagessima*, rebukes *those vain Fellows who abuse Election and Reprobation to carnal Liberty, or Presumption:* Why so doth *Calvin*, so doth *Ursin*, so do our Divines at the Synod of *Dort*. "*Hooper* in his Pre-"face to the ten Commandments, as quoted by Doctor, "*page* 38. saith, we must not extenuate Original Sin, nor "make God the Author of Evil; nor yet say, that God "hath written fatal Laws, (with the Stoicks) and in the ne-"cessity of destiny, violently pulleth one by the hair of the "head into Heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into "Hell. All this is just according to *Calvin*'s method; no Calvinist saith, that God's Decree offereth violence to Man's Will, or pulleth a man into Heaven; only they say, that Electing love makes men willing, and that Holiness is an effect of Election; as for Sin, that they say, is not an effect of Reprobation, but only a consequent.

Ay, *but Bishop* Latimer *teacheth us, that we are to enquire no further after our Election, then it is to be found in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; Dr. *Heylin page* 39. Why so teach all the Calvinists too, that our Election is not to be known, but by our knowledg of our interest in Christ; but the Anti-calvinist will not say with *Latimer*, if thou findest thy self in Christ, then are thou sure of eternal life; he saith, a man may be in Christ, and be a Reprobate; a man may be in Christ to day, and in Hell to morrow.

Perhaps the Doctor will find more against Calvinistical Reprobation, or if he do not, he must be concluded to have beaten the Air. First we must hear what he makes Calvinistical Reprobation to be, 'tis that he saith, *by which the far greater part of mankind are pre-ordained, and consequently pre-condemned to the pit of torments, without any respect had unto*

their

their sins and incredulities. This is generally, he saith, maintained and taught in the Schools of Calvin. If it be so, then I am sure I never was in any School of *Calvin*; for I never heard or read of any such Reprobation; nay, I never read of any person whatsoever, that asserted such a Reprobation. Sundry famous Schoolmen, quoted by Dr. *Rivet* in his fifth Disputation *de Reprobatione*, were of opinion, that *if God had decreed even innocent creatures to eternal damnation, he had decreed nothing unworthy of himself*; and they seem to have but too much countenance for this bold and audacious Tenet from a passage of St. *Austin*'s, in his 16. *cap. de Prædestinatione & Gratiâ*. But the Calvinists (as many as I have met with) say, that as God never actually damned any man but for sin, so he never decreed to damn any but for sin; all that they say is but this, that whereas *Judas* and *Peter* were both alike corrupted by the fall, and both alike apt by nature to abuse and reject grace, the reason why God determined effectually to cure the corruption of *Peter* and not of *Judas*, was the meer good pleasure of his will; the Calvinists are not engaged to say, that God reprobates any who was not worthy to be reprobated; all that their opinion obligeth them to, is but this, not to make sin the cause of preterition, or non-election, comparatively considered; and against such preterition there is nothing in the Prayers of our Church, nothing in *Latimer*, nothing in *Hooper*, nothing in *Cranmer*, nothing in the whole Tenth Chapter of the Doctor's second Part; and it is a wonder that so ancient a Divine should trouble himself in so many pages, to do execution upon a meer Chimæra; and yet this employment was so pleasing and acceptable to him, that he falls to it again in his Eleventh Chapter, in which, *page* 64. he makes the main Controversie in the Point of mans Conversion to move upon this hinge, *whether the influences of God's grace be so strong and powerful, that withal they are absolutely irresistible, so that it is not possible for the will of man not to consent unto the same?* But they that have either read the Determinations of the Synod of *Dort*, or *Calvin*'s own Institutions, know that the Controversie moves upon no such hinge; but this is the Question, *Whether when converting Grace hath produced the whole effect God designed it unto, man still remains unconverted, and indifferent either to turn himself, or not turn himself unto God.*

If

If converting Grace do leave a man thus indifferent, they say, that Conversion is rather to be ascribed to man then God; and that *Paul* made himself to differ from other Persecutors, and not God: but they never say, that God forceth or offereth violence unto the natural faculty of the will, or destroyeth any liberty that is essential to it; if any violence be offered, it is only unto corrupt lusts, and sinful inclinations: in which, I hope, I may have fair liberty to say, that the freedom of mans will doth not consist. Let but any one fairly and impartially state this Question, by drawing Propositions concerning it out of the Writings before mentioned, and he will find nothing in *Hooper* or *Latimer* contradictory. The tenth Article of King *Edward*'s he will find perfectly to express the mind of the Calvinists, and so I might dismiss this matter, had not the Doctor thought meet *page 67.* as also in another writing, gone about to smite at us with a Dilemma, or something like a Dilemma, grounded upon the omitting of this Article in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, *either this Article did favour Calvinism, or it did not*; if it did not, *why do the Calvinists alleadg it*; if it did, *why is it in our latter Editions of the Articles left out.* We have learnt from Logick, that such Dilemma's are not to be used, which may be inverted or retorted upon those that make them; and such is the present Dilemma, apparently, notoriously such: for thus I argue, either this Article is Anti-calvinistical, or it is not; if it be not, why doth the Doctor produce it as such? if it be, why did our Reformers in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time (who were, as he would fain perswade us, Anti-calvinistical) leave it out? he must either answer for himself, or not expect that we should answer for our selves; which yet we could easily do, did any Law of Disputation require it of us: for this might be the the reason of the omission, because there was nothing in King *Edward*'s tenth Article, but what doth naturally and lineally descend from our present seventeenth Article.

I will follow the Doctor whither he leads me, when I have first admonisht my Reader, not to prejudice himself by what so frequently occurs among our Protestant Writers, *that works done before the grace of Christ do not make men meet to receive grace*; for it will be found agreeable unto Scripture, that works done before Conversion, may leave in the Soul a material disposition, or a passive preparedness to receive grace;

no

no preparation can be wrought by them that deserves grace; none from which grace necessarily flows; but yet such may be wrought, as from which a man may be denominated more meet, and more likely to receive the undeserved love of God, then if he wanted it: just as we say in natural Philosophy, that though the rational soul do not emerge out of the organization of the matter, but is immediately inspired by God, yet an organical matter is a more prepared subject to receive such a soul, then a matter not organized.

I promised after I had laid down this caution, to follow the Doctor, and so I will, to his twelfth Chapter; but in it I shall not need to stay long with him, for it is wholly spent in laying down the Doctrine of Free-will, as it was agreed upon in the Popish Convocation, *Anno* 1543. wherefore though there be nothing in the Article of Free-will there delivered, but what a Calvinist (allowing him but a favorable interpretation) may subscribe to; yet the Doctrine of the Reformed Church of *England*, must not be measured by the decisions of that Popish Convocation in the thirteenth Chapter, entituled, concerning the certainty or uncertainty of Perseverance, passing over the debates in the Council of *Trent*, which will be of no use to us to find out the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. Page 81. *the Calvinists are charged to presume, not only to know all things that belong to their present justification, as assuredly as they know that Christ is in Heaven, but also to be as sure of their eternal election, and of their future glorification, as they are of this Article of their Creed, that Christ was born of the Virgin* Mary. If any Calvinist ever said so, he erred greatly, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the deceitfulness of his own heart; but if never any Calvinist said so, what shall then be done to him that so presumptuously bears false witness against them? Certainly the Calvinists do not hold, that the Doctrine of Perseverance is so fundamental, or so clearly delivered in Scripture, as the Doctrine of Christ's nativity, so far are they from holding that they themselves, or any of them, do as certainly know the goodness of their present state, or their eternal election, as they firmly believe the Article of their Saviour's being born of the Virgin *Mary*; they are all wont to distinguish of a certitude of the object, and a certitude of the subject; they say, 'tis certain from the Word, that he who is a sound Believer, shall continue to be a Believer,

liever, until he attain the end of his Faith; but they say, a man may be a Believer, and yet not be certain that he does believe; and if once he had a certain perswasion of his faith, he may lose that perswasion; and many of them (I am sure) say, that he must lose it as oft as he falls into any conscience-wasting sin; this is the Doctrine that agrees with our Articles, and with the judgment of our first Reformers; if any man deliver the Doctrine of Perseverance at a higher rate, the Calvinists are not concerned to defend him. The sixteenth Article of our Church is brought by the Doctor against Perseverance; the words of it are these: *Not every deadly sin committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable; wherefore the grants of repentance is not to be denied to such as do fall into sin after Baptism: after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives: and therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here; or deny place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.* From which Article they may, in the judgment of our Church, be concluded to be in an error, who hold that every sin committed after Baptism, is the sin against the Holy Ghost; but so do not the Calvinists hold. They also are by this Article condemned, who say, they can no more sin as long as they live here; but what Calvinists say so? They finally are condemned, who deny place of forgiveness to such as truly repent; in which number the Calvinists cannot be placed, but some of the Remonstrants may; and it were to be wished, that some of our English Writers might not also be placed among them. The Article having made a [Therefore] its strange that any one should draw any other conclusion from it, then what it self hath drawn; strange that any one should write, that our Church intended by this Article to determine, that the faith by which the just man lives, may be totally lost. Let an Argument be made, the Church says, after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from the grace given, and fall into sin; therefore it saith, we may fall into such a sin as quite extinguisheth grace; or therefore it saith, that grace may be quite and for ever lost; any one that understands himself, will deny both these consequents, and deny them he may without danger or fear. But let us view the

Doctor's

Doctor's thoughts about this Article, *page* 84. he bolts out a maxime in the Civil Law, *non esse distinguendum ubi Lex non distinguit*; that no distinctions must be made in the explicating and expounding any Law, which is not to be found in the Law it self. I acknowledg, that such a saying is commonly quoted from the Civilians; and as they understand it, it is very rational: But how do the Calvinists willingly oppose themselves against this maxime? their Tenet is, *regeniti nunquam totaliter excidunt à gratia*; and some of them perhaps say, *regeniti non possunt excidere à gratia totaliter*: If any man will disprove them from the Article, he must out of the Article draw some conclusion that contradicts their Tenet; which if any one go about to do, he will find himself at a loss, and will be never able to put them to the cost of a distinction. Foreseeing that this maxime might not serve his turn, he tells us, for the clear understanding of the Churches meaning, we must have recourse in this, as in other Articles, to the plain words of Bishop *Hooper* and Bishop *Latimer*. But why must we have recourse to these mens writings, above and beyond all other mens of that age? Bishop *Latimer* never resuming his Bishoprick, cannot be thought to be in any capacity, to sit so much as a Member of the Convocation 1552. Bishop *Hooper* indeed had a right to a place in the Upper House, and 'tis like took his place; but his Exposition on the Commandments, was Printed four years before that Convocation sate. My Edition, which I use, was Printed 1548. when he was a popular Preacher, and, I think, an unlicenced Preacher; Bishop he was not till 1550. But if this Book had been made after the conclusion of the Convocation, it could be no Rule to interpret the Articles which were drawn up, at least in one point, quite contrary to his declared judgment: If every thing in that Book pass for the Doctrine of the Church, down fall all our Gentlemens Pigeon-houses, down falls, &c.

But what need all this? Bishop *Hooper* hath not any thing in his Preface to his Exposition to the ten Commandments for total Apostasie, or against Perseverance; he only saith, *The cause of some mens damnation is this, that after they have received the promise of the Gospel, by accustomed doing of ill, they fall unto a contempt of the Gospel.* Many a man receives the promise of the Gospel, who doth not receive it into a

good

good honest heart, and therefore was never sanctified or justified. Was not then the Doctor hard put to it, when we could find no passage in *Hooper* to oppose to the Doctrine of Perseverance, but only this? If *Hooper* speak no more plainly in his Paraphrase on the thirteenth Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, then in his Preface to his Exposition of the Commandments, he speaks just nothing at all to the Doctor's purpose: As neither doth Mr. *Tindal* in his Prologue to his Exposition of the Epistle to the *Romans*, whose words are brought in for sundry lines, *page* 85. but tend only to prove, *That if a man break the Law, he must sue for a new pardon, and have a new light against sin, hell, and despairation, ere he can come to a quiet faith again, and feel that sin is forgiven; and that the promise of mercy and forgiveness is made on this condition, that we sin no more.* Some Followers of *Isebius Agricola*, may peradventure enter their dissent from Mr. *Tindal* in this matter, so may also the English Antinomians; but so need not any one who embraceth the Determinations of the Synod of *Dort*; for in those Determinations, if they were searched with a candle, it will never be found, that men are not bound to renew their repentance, as they renew their sin; or that they can have a quiet conscience, or sense of pardon, till they have converted themselves out of every snare of the Devil.

It had been, it seems, objected by Mr. *Hickman*, that Mr. *Montague* himself, both in his Gagg and his Appeal, had confessed, that the Church had left it undecided, whether a Saint may fall totally and finally? What hath the Doctor against this? That he doth so in the Gag, I easily grant; where he relateth only to the Article, which speaks only of a possibility of falling, without relation to the measure or continuance of it (here by the way, it is fairly confessed, that the Article speaks not of the possibility of falling totally, or finally, therefore not against the Calvinists.) *But he must needs be carried with a very strange confidence, which can report so of him in his Appeal, in which he both expresly saith, and proveth the contrary.* Doth he indeed say so? where may such a man as I am find him saying so? *Page*, not 28. but 26. he saith, *That there is not from the Church any tie put on him, to resolve in this much disputed Question, as these Novellers would have it; for if there be any, it is for possibility of total falling,*

as

as we shall hear anon. Is this to say expressly, that the Church hath so determined? then farewel the study of Logick; I am sure however, that if he said it, he hath not proved it. *Page* 29. he quotes the words of the Article, *After that we have received the Holy Ghost; we may depart away from grace, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives.* After quoting of them, as if his heart had misgiven him, he addeth; *Haply you will quarrel at the sense of the Articles; but then you must remember, that the plain words sound to the meaning for which I have produced them; and that until the Church it self expound otherwise, it is as free for me to take it according to the letter, as for you to devise a figure.* Which done, he goes on most untruly to tell the World, that this Article was challenged for unsound by the Ministers at the *Hampton-Court* Conference; of which untruth, and sundry others relating to Dr. *Overal*, and the Bishop of *London*, he hath been told by so many, that it is a wonder any man should not be ashamed to plough with his Heifer. The Arguments out of the Liturgy, whether in the form of Baptism, or in the publick Catechism, or Rubrick before Confirmation, are quite besides the Controversie; which is by many Calvinists restrained to the grace bestowed on Adult persons, and by none understood of that Sacramental grace given to the Seed of Believers in Baptism. His Reasons from the Homilies, if they were of any force when managed by another, do lose their whole strength when they come from him; who hath told us, *That he willingly admits the Homilies, as containing certain godly and wholsome exhortations, but not as the publick dogmatical Resolutions confirmed by the Church of* England: *They may seem to speak somewhat too hardly, and stretch some saying beyond the use and practice of the Church of* England. But let it suffice, that he hath trampled upon our Homilies with a foot of pride; I dare not so do, honouring the memory, and reverencing the judgment of those who made them; and much more the Authority that hath enjoyned them to be read in Churches. Let Mr. *Mountague* and Dr. *Heylin* argue from the Homilies, as if they had never traduced them. Mr. *Mountague* argues from the title of one of the Homilies, which is, *Falling away from God*; as if the very title were a sufficient warrant for his opinion: whereas no one of our Homilies is entituled, Of

falling away from God, but only of falling from God. Ridiculous it would be, adds Dr. *Heylin*, *page* 88. to *write a Sermon* de non ente, *to terrifie the people with the danger of that misfortune, which they were well assured they should never suffer.* By which addition he makes himself more then ridiculous; for people are not by the Calvinists well assured, that they shall never suffer the misfortune of falling from God; but are told, that they fall from God, as oft as they turn away from God's Law; and that by every such turning away from God's Law, if wilful, they lose some degree of grace, and expose themselves to the wrath of God, and lose all sense of his favor, and this is sufficient to terrifie any man that is in his right wits and senses. Nor doth the Homily it self more favor them, then the title of it; out of which neither collects more then a conditional, if they be unthankful, if they do not order their lives, &c. Now the very Rule of the Logicians is, *conditionalis nihil ponit in esse.* Will Doctor *Heylin* quarrel against this Rule? yes; for Mr. *Yates* having brought such a kind of Answer, he saith of it, that *it is a sorrier shift then any before; for if such conditional Propositions conclude nothing positively, what will become of all those Propositions in the Scriptures, by which we are assured, if we repent, we shall find mercy of the Lord? Do they conclude nothing positively neither? most miserable were the state of man, if these conditional Propositions should conclude nothing to the comfort of a troubled conscience*, page 96. O dreadful ignorance! can a conditional Proposition conclude nothing positively and determinately, unless it conclude, that its antecedent shall actually come to pass, or may come to pass? When *Paul* saith, if an Angel from Heaven preach another Gospel, let him be accursed; this conditional will conclude, that whoever preacheth another Gospel, is accursed; it will not conclude, that ever any Angel can, or shall preach another Gospel. What pity it is, that men should adventure to write Books, after they have forgot the common Elements of Logick? and what shame is it, that men should dare to bring in passages out of our Homilies, and omit a material Parenthesis that occurs in all Copies of them, as any one may see that both Mr. *Mountague* and Dr. *Heylin* have done. only desire, seeing the Homilies are commonly to be had, that my Readers would be pleased them to compare them with

with the quotations of Dr. *Heylin*, *page* 89. and remember that the thing he is to prove out of the Homilies, is, *that real Saints may fall totally and finally from sanctifying grace received*, and then let him be deceived if he can; provided that he will also consider, what passages Mr. *Yates* and Mr. *Prinne* have collected out of the Homilies, to confirm Perseverance. One more Authority Dr. *Heylin* produceth, and it filleth up *pag.* 90, 91. it is the Authority of *Lancelot Ridley* Arch-Deacon of *Canterbury*, out of whose Comment on the *Collossians*, he collects something relating to all, or most of the controverted Points; but the Collections, if all truly made, have not in them so much as a seeming contrariety to any of Mr. *Calvin*'s Tenets. But in this very Arch-Deacon's Comment on the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Mr. *Prinne* finds personal Election; and if Election, then Perseverence also. The Doctors not medling with that Commentary, his not mentioning *Bartholomew Traheron* Dean of *Chicester*, and Library Keeper to King *Edward*, nor *Thomas Beacon*, nor *Anthony Gilby*, nor *Stephen Garret*, all famous in King *Edward*'s Reign, and whose Books might easily have been procured by one that lived so near *Oxford* as *Lacy Court*, is an undeniable evidence, that he himself did not think King *Edward*' Divinity and his own to be the same.

In all the third Part, our Historian is put to horrible shifts, and plaies a very low game indeed; and no wonder, for he finds the opinions he contends against, delivered out of the Chairs in the University, countenanced by all Authority, Civil and Ecclesiastical; his own opinions he finds censured, recanted, never Printed but in hugger mugger, and by stealth; and yet I do not find him much changing countenance, but rather with confidence enough asserting himself a Son of the Church; and his Doctrine, a Doctrine of the Church. His first attempt is to disgrace the Calvinists, by calling them Gospellers; for this he phrasifieth *page* 2. "There were some men, who in the beginning of King *Ed*-"*ward*'s Reign, busily stickled in the maintenance of *Cal*-"*vin*'s Doctrines; and thinking themselves to be more E-"vangelical then the rest of their Brethren, they either took "unto themselves, or had given by others, the name of "Gospellers. Of this they were informed by the Reverend "Prelate, and right godly Martyr Bishop *Hooper*, in the

"Preface to his Exposition of the ten Commandments, *Our Gospellers* (saith he) *be better learned then the Holy Ghost; for they wickedly attribute the cause of punishments and adversities, to God's providence; which is the cause of no ill, as he himself can do no evil; and over every mischief, they say, it is God's will.* "In which we have the men and their Doctrine; how "the name of Gospellers, and the reason why that name was "ascribed to them. It is observed by the judicious Author of "*Europæ Speculum*, that *Calvin* was the first of these latter "times, who searched into the Counsels (the eternal "Counsels) of God Almighty: And, as it seems, he found "there some other Gospel then that which had been written "by the four Evangelists, from whence his Followers had "the name of Gospellers; for by that name I find them cal-"led frequently by *Campney*, in an Epistolary discourse, &c. "and finding it given them also by Bishop *Hooper*, (a tem-"perate modest man) I must needs look on it as the name "of the Sect, by which they were distinguished from other "men.

All this I have at large transcribed, because I have sundry observations to make thereupon. First, I observe, that in all probability the Doctor never read *Hooper*, but trusted to other mens eyes; for he quoteth that as from the Preface of Mr. *Hooper*, which is not to be found in the Preface, but rather in his Postscript, or Appendix to his Declaration of the ten holy Commandments; or his Answer to certain Objections, that keep men from the obedience of God's Law: The fourth of which is curiosity; nor is this the first time that he hath suffered himself and his Reader to be abused. Secondly, I observe, that he attributes these words to the Reverend Prelate, and right godly Martyr, Bishop *Hooper*; whereas *Hooper*, when he did write these words, was no Prelate, but only a licenced, if licenced, Predicant. But I am glad however to find Dr. *Heylin* speak so honorably of the King-leader of the Non-conformists; it seems, when he is pleased, he can allow one that scrupled the Habit, and expressly condemned the Civil Offices of Bishops, to be Reverend, and right godly, and temperate, and modest. Thirdly, I observe, that he chargeth Mr. *Calvin*, from the Author of *Europæ Speculum*, to be the first in these latter times that searched into the Counsels, the eternal Counsels

of

of Almighty God. That the Author of *Europæ Speculum* hath any such observation, I am not sure; if he have it, no way contributed to procure him that esteem with which the World reads his Book; for as all eternal Counsels are the Counsels of Almighty God, so all the Counsels of God Almighty are eternal: And to say, that *Calvin* was the first, who in this latter age searched into the Counsels of Almighty God, is in effect to say, that none of this latter age, before *Calvin*, regarded God's glory, or mans salvation; I suppose insteed of eternal Counsels, the Doctor intended to say, hidden unrevealed Counsels. But the assertion of absolute Election and Reprobation, is no searching into the secrets of God Almighty; or if it be, Mr. *Calvin* cannot, by any one that hath the least skill in History, be thought to be the first that searched into God's secret Counsels, seeing both *Luther* and *Zuinglius* had done it before him. Fourthly, I observe, the unrighteous censure or calumny of the Doctor, that *Calvin*, by searching into God's Decrees, had found out another Gospel then that which had been written by the four Evangelists, from whence his Followers in these Points, had the name of Gospellers. Neither *Calvin*, nor Calvinists, ever found out any other Gospel then this, *he that believeth, shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned.* Nor was the name of Gospellers given to Mr. *Calvin*'s Followers, on the account of their bringing in a new Gospel, or on any other account; but it was the general name by which all that joyned in oppesing Popery called themselves. Let any one but consult the word Gospellers, in the Index of Mr. *Fox*'s Martyrology, and compare the places there referred unto, he shall find Papists and Gospellers still opposed; and Gospellers used, not as a name of ignominy, but as a name of honour. Let him also read Bishop *Ridley*'s Letter to his Chaplain, he shall find the same word used, and contradistinguished to Papists; likewise in Latine no more usual distinction then *Pontificii* and *Evangelici*: So that the Historian, in making the Calvinists the only Gospellers, makes them indeed the only Protestants. Finally, I observe, that the words quoted from Bishop *Hooper* are inexcusable, if they be not qualified with some distinction. The Scripture doth not oftner ascribe unto God the Creation of the World, then it doth ascribe unto his Providence all the Punishments and Adversities that

besal either good or bad men; yet it must be granted, that God does not willingly afflict the sons of men; and therefore never punishes them, but when he finds something in them which deserves the punishment; so that they may thank themselves for all the evil they suffer from God.

The Doctor's next design is to vindicate one *Campneys*, a Fellow that was made to bear a Faggot at *Paul*'s Cross in King *Edward*'s time; the learned and pious *Miles Coverdale* preaching a Sermon when that punishment was inflicted on him: This man, it seems, having either complied in Queen *Mary*'s time, or saved himself alive by flight, when Q. *Elizabeth* had restored the true Religion, began to play his old pranks, *i. e.* to cause disturbance, by nibbling at such who were deservedly honoured and preferred in the Church; publishing a Pamphlet, but unto which he had not courage enough to affix his name, against Predestination. This Pamphlet was encountred by Mr. *John Veron*, a Chaplain to the Queen, and Reader of the Divinity Lecture in St. *Paul*'s Church, as also by Mr. *Robert Crowley*, sometime Fellow of *Magdalene* Colledg in *Oxon*, at that time a famous Preacher in the City of *London*; Both these put out Answers unto *Campneys*, and their Answers were both licenced and approved, and *Veron*'s Dedicated to the Queen her self; whereas *Campneys* virulent Pamphlet came forth surreptitiously, neither Author nor Printer daring to put their names to it. All this notwithstanding, the Doctor would have us believe, that *Campneys* defended the Doctrine of the Church, *Veron* and *Crowley* opposed it; as if the Church had so soon lost all her zeal for her Religion, and would give no countenance at all to those that contended for it, yet would vouchsafe to authorize the writings of those that vigorously fought against it. We need not say, that *Campneys* deserved all the ill names that *Veron* and *Crowley* bestowed on him, perhaps their zeal might be in some particulars too bitter; yet we cannot think that men of so great repute and learning would charge Pelagianism and Popery, upon one that had honestly declared himself against both Popery and Pelagianism.—The Doctor tells us that *Campneys* hath sufficiently purged himself of both these crimes; and indeed, by reading his Book, I find that he hath declared himself against merit; but so hath many a professed Papist done. He doth also muster up the errors of *Pelagius*, publickly

publickly recanted by him in the Synod of *Palestine*, declaring them (or at least one of them) to be vile and abominable: This notwithstanding, it is possible he might be a very Pelagian. *Austin* himself doth not speak more sharply against *Pelagius*, then do the Ring-leaders of the Semipelagians, and yet they err as bad an error as the Pelagians do. But of all these matters let indifferent Readers judg; by comparing *Campneys* Book, with the Answers made to it. More I need not say about the sixteenth Chapter, had it not pleased the Historian to defame *Calvin*, *Beza* and *Knox*; *Calvin* and *Beza*, he charges with unworthy practices used against *Sebastian Castal*; a man, he says, of no less learning, but of far more modesty and moderation then either of them; yet they never left persecuting and reviling him, till they had first cast him out of *Geneva*, and afterwards brought him to his grave, meerly because he differed from them about Predestination. *Calvin* and *Beza*'s learning, modesty, and moderation, are sufficiently vindicated by others; *Castalio* discovered little, either of modesty or moderation, in his bitter censures of the Book of *Canticles*, or in his help and assistance he afforded unto the cursed Socinians. *Beza* and *Calvin* are not the only persons that have condemned him; nor did they condemn him meerly, or principally, for differing from them in the point of Predestination, as the Doctor might have known, if he had rather consulted the impartial Historians of that time, then *Castalio*'s own writings.

For Mr. *Knox*, styled *page* 5. *The great Incendiary of the Nation and Kirk of* Scotland, I will not undertake an Apology; his own Country-men, who were better acquainted with his principles and practices, may better do it: yet because I find him to have taken great pains in promoting our Reformation here in *England*, I shall adventure to mind the Doctor, that *Spotswood*, purposely employed by our King to write the History of the Kirk of *Scotland*, and having also by the King liberty given him to write truth impartially, doth make very honourable mention of Mr. *Knox*: And our own Bishop *Ridley* joyns him with *Latimer*, *Leaver*, *Bradford*, and commends them all for their sharp reproof of all sins and sinners in King *Edward*'s days.

D. H. Page 18.

"No sooner had that gracious Lady, Queen *Elizabeth*, "attained the Crown, then she took order for the review-"ing of the publick Liturgy, appointing for the review "Dr. *Parker*, Dr. *Grindal*, Dr. *Pilkinton*, Dr. *Cox*, Dr. "*May*, Dr. *Bill*, Mr. *Whitehead*, Sir *Thomas Smith*.

'Tis true, such a revision was appointed, and performed by the men here mentioned: I intend not a character of them, they have their characters already given them by abler Pens; but so principled they were, that if any thing had been left in the Liturgy favouring conditional Election, or the Apostasie of Saints, it had not failed to be blotted out. The injunctions of Queen *Elizabeth* are mentioned by the Doctor *page* 19. in which he observes, that *Erasmus* his Paraphrases were appointed to be provided for every Church, *Injunct.* 6. & *Injunct.* 16. that every Parson, Vicar, Curate, Stipendiary Priest, (he omits under the degree of a Master of Arts) should provide and have of his own, the New Testament in Latine and English, with the Paraphrases (the Injunction saith only, with Paraphrases.) The conclusion he hence infers, hath been before considered. I must take notice, that the 51. Injunction straitly chargeth and commandeth, that no manner of person shall Print any manner of Book or Paper, of what sort, nature, or in what Language soever it be, except the same be first licenced by her Majesty by express words in writings, or by six of her Privy Councel; or be perused and licenced by the Arch-Bishops of *Canterbury* and *York*, the Bishop of *London*, the Chancellors of both Universities, the Bishop being Ordinary, and the Arch-Deacon also of the place where any such shall be Printed, or by two of them, whereof the Ordinary of the place shall always be one; and that the names of such as shall allow the same, to be added to the end of every such work, for a testimony of the allowance thereof. From this Injunction I infer, that *Campneys* had no respect at all unto the Queens Order, or else he would not have published his Papers without Authority. I also infer secondly, that neither Queen, nor Councel, nor Arch-Bishops, nor Bishops, were of *Campneys* mind, because else he would have prevailed with some of them to authorize his Book, that it might have been

more

more passable: and now, if the Doctor have got any thing by these Injunctions, much good may it do him.

Page 20. he gives us a very merry conceit, that the Zuinglians being increased exceedingly, both in power and numbers; and notice being taken thereof by those that were of most Authority in the government of the Church, it was thought necessary, that the Articles of Religion published 1552. should be reviewed, accommodated to the use of the Church, and made to be the standing Rule, by which all persons were to regulate and confirm their Doctrine. He would have extreamly obliged us, had he but vouchsafed to name any one person intrusted in the government of the Church at that time, who was in the least offended with the Zuinglian Doctrine: We have Records, from which it may appear who were *Anno* 1562. Arch-Bishops and Bishops; amongst them all it will be hard to find any one that was not a cordial Friend unto the Doctrine of *Zuinglius* and *Calvin*; some of them are blamed for agreeing too well with them in matter of Discipline and Ceremony also: The names of almost all may be found in Mr. *Fuller*, Book 9. page 69. But the Historian would have done no less then wonders, if he had informed us, how the passing of the Articles in Queen *Elizabeth*'s first Convocation, could be a probable means to suppress the growth of the Zuinglian Doctrine: Certain I am, that if they were designed for any such use, they had no prosperous success; but were in the days of Queen *Elizabeth*, and King *James* made use of to suppress the Antizuinglian Doctrine. Indeed the seventeenth Article, plainly lays down such a Predestination, as the Articalvinistical ear cannot hear; and the Homilies so much commended in the Articles, have a little too much Calvinism in them; for they place Faith in such a kind of assurance, as Mr. *Calvin* indeed thought essential to Faith, but is found by experience to be seperable from it: I would transcribe the passages in the Homilies that relate unto the five Points, but Mr. *Prin* hath already done it, and done it so throughly, that nothing considerable seems to have escaped his diligence. I beg of my Reader, that he would vouchsafe to put together Dr. *Heylin*'s and Mr. *Prin*'s Allegations out of the Homilies, and then pass judgment. There was a probable Argument drawn from the Prolocutor of this Convocation, Mr. *Alexander Nowel*; he must needs be supposed

supposed fully to know the mind and sense of those that confirm'd the Articles; nor can it be supposed, that he had not a great hand in the drawing of them up; yet this reverend and learned Person, in his Catechism, published by him after this Convocation, doth declare himself for absolute Election. Places clearly proving this were alledged out of an English Translation of that Catechism by Mr. *Norton*, dedicated to the two Arch-Bishops, the Bishop of *London* by name, and to all the other Bishops in the several Diocesses in *England*. This was printed by *John Day*, with the Queens Majesties priviledg for ten years, *Anno* 1575. In answering this Objection the Doctor spends many words, even so many as make up *pag.* 24, 25, 26, 27. of some of these words I know not how to make any sense; of others of them I think I know the meaning, but cannot perceive their design; for admitting there hath been a lesser and a greater Catechism of Mr. *Nowels*, admitting that which is authorized to be taught in Schools is the less and not the bigger, what is either gained or lost, unless the Author had declared his judgment with some diversity in the two Catechisms? which is not, cannot be pretended: what though I do not find any one single Question concerning Predestination, or the Points thereupon, may not the Author in Answer to other Questions sufficiently declare his mind? I will set down the passages quoted by Mr. *Hickman* at large. To the Church do all they properly belong, as manyas do truly fear, and honour, and call upon God, altogether applying their minds to live holily and godly, and putting all their trust in God, do most assuredly look for the blessednes of eternal life. They that be stedfast, stable, constant in this Faith, were chosen and appointed, and (as we term it) Predestinated to this so great Felicity.

The Church is the Body of the Christian Common-wealth, *i. e.* the universal number and fellowship of the Faithful, whom God through Christ hath before all beginning of time appointed to everlasting life.

This the Doctor saith is not to be found in the Latine Edition; but I say, and am sure of it, it is to be found in the Latine Edition of 1570. set forth by the Author, and Printed by *Reginald Wolf*, the Queens Latine Printer. He saith secondly, it is taken almost word for word out of Bishop

Poinets

Poinet's Catechism; and therefore must be understood in no other sense then before it was, when it was perused and approved by the Bishops, and other Learned men of King *Edward*'s time; if so, then up goes Calvinism; for we have before proved Arch-Deacon *Philpot* one of those Learned men expressly owning *Calvin*'s Predestination; nor is it possible to interpret *Poinet*'s words, so as, that Faith shall be an antecedent, and not consequent of Predestination. He that saith, only those who are predestinated to Eternal life believe; doth say, that no Believer can finally fall from Faith, if he understand the necessary consequences of his saying, as in justice we are bound to think so great a Scholar as Bishop *Poinet* did. But of *Poinet* no more, Mr. *Nowel*'s own words are plain and clear for an election unto Faith and Salvation, before the foundations of the World were laid; and that they who are thus elected, have in their own minds the spirit of Christ, the Author of this confidence, and in like manner a most certain pledg of it. The Scholar finally is taught to say, that by the instinct of the Divine Spirit, he most certainly perswades himself, that he also by God's good gift through Christ, is freely made one of this blessed City. And it is further worth observation, that there is scarce any one place of Scripture made use of by the Calvinists to prove Personal election, which Mr. *Nowel* hath not put into the Margin of his Catechism; *Matth.* 16. 18. *Rom.* 8. 29, 30. *Ephes.* 1. 4, 5. *Col.* 3. 12. *Tit.* 1. 1. *Rom.* 8. 9, 15, 16. 2 *Cor.* 1. 22. and 5. 5. *Ephes.* 1. 13. 14. and 5. 30. all this notwithstanding the Doctor pleaseth himself, as if Mr. *Nowel* were his own: and that he might not seem to lay claim to him without some ground, he produceth two places out of his lesser Catechism, promised by the Author in the Epistle Dedicatory of the larger, and now, as more apt for youth, commonly taught in Grammar Schools, *page* 33. in tender compassion unto him and my Reader, I will not relate them; but they are both such, as any Calvinist will embrace with both arms, as favoring of that special Faith that some ancient Calvinists, too securely following their Master, contend for. In it the Doctor finds, that we are elected by, or through faith in Christ; therefore the Decree of Election is not absolute and irrespective: Nor do the Calvinists say, it is without a limitation or distinction of the word, irrespective and absolute. The

second

second passage is such, as no Remonstrant can mention without abhorrence; for Remonstrants do utterly deny, that God made any Covenant with *Adam*, that if he stood, all his Posterity should stand; if he fell, all his Posterity should fall, and be corrupted with Original Sin; but the Calvinist is eager for this Covenant; and no less eagerly doth he contend, that God promised to send Christ, the Seed of the Woman, to break the Serpent's head, that is, the Devil, and so to deliver him and his Posterity that believed the same; for this, if it proves any thing, proves particular Redemption; which the most famous Calvinists now a days do not contend for, some of them have written whole Books against it. I shall only insert one passage more out of Mr. *Nowel*'s Catechism, relating to the peremptorinesse and irreversibility of God's will of purpose; it is in his Exposition of the third Petition of the Lord's Prayer: *Non tantum precamur ut quod illi decretum fuerit eveniat; quod, quum divina voluntas efficiendi necessitatem secum semper adferat evenire necesse est:* quoting in the Margin *Psal.* 115. 3. and 135. 6, 7. *Rom.* 9. 19. and so my Pen takes its leave of this holy and learned Person, a constant hearer of *Peter Martyr*, both wonderfully preserved from the fury of the Bishops, and both, no doubt, of one mind in these matters.

In the next place I am to wait on the Doctor to the Queen *Elizabeth* Homilies, for he hath adventured to look into them, and a great adventure it had been to look into them, if so be he had looked into them with any intention to answer what had been alledged against him by Mr. *Prin*, as to consider what made for him. I have already entreated my Reader to give himself the trouble of comparing passages of all sorts, and then there will remain no further trouble for me. I am sure no man can think, that any thing in the 29, 30, 31. *pages* of the Doctor's third Part, collected out of the Homilies, is contradictory to the Calvinists assertions rightly understood. The Homily of the Nativity saith, *Christ must be not only full and perfect man, but also full and perfect God; to the intent he might more fully and perfectly make satisfaction for mankind.* This, saith the Doctor, is as plain as words can make it; and plain indeed it is, against any that deny either the Deity or Humanity of Christ (those that do so, usually deny God's Decrees too) but there is here neither

ther plain, nor obscure words, or word against Calvinists: Every one will laugh at the passage brought for Universal Grace, out of the first part of the Sermon against the peril of Idolatry; which amounts to no more then this, *that Idolatry is against the light of Nature as well as Scripture*: Yet in this passage did he so much please himself, that he proceeds to tell us, that in the third Part of that Sermon, there are some passages, that do as plainly speak of *falling from God, the final alienation of the soul of a man once righteous from his love and favour.* Such passages as these would be worth Gold, the fine Gold of *Ophir.* He names but one, which is this: *How much better were it, that the Arts of Painting and we had never been found, then one of them whose souls are so precious in the sight of God, should by occasion of Image, a Picture, perish and be lost.* This passage looks as if it were designed to perswade Christian Magistrates to break down all Images of God, Christ, the Saints, especially in Churches (on which score these Sermons against Idolatry have been decried by sundry of the Doctor's Friends) but what hath it in it, that by all the help of the whole Art of Logick can militate against Perseverance. Better it were that Painting had never been found out, then that by occasion of a Picture, a precious Soul should perish and be lost; therefore the Souls of the Elect, of justified and righteous Persons, may be totally and finally alienated from the grace and favor of God. I will form another Argument against Perseverance, out of the Homily of the Resurrection. The Homilist very affectionately dissuades those that are risen with Christ from returning from sin; therefore he took it for granted, that some truly sanctified Souls might totally and finally fall from grace. These two are pretty, but the prettiest passage of all is still behind; *The co-operation of mans will with the grace of God* (he must mean, or else he trifleth, in the very first moment of conversion) *is presumed, or else our Church had not writ any Homilies at all.* Just so he might argue, that if *Calvin* had not held co-operation, he would never have preached Sermons; and indeed out of *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Zuinglius*, may easily be gathered five hundred places that have a more seeming and colourable face of contrariety against Calvinism, then any that the Doctor hath made a shift to gather out of our English Homilies. Yet least he might be thought faint-hearted, he

he goes on from the Homilies to Bishop *Jewel*, the Copier out of *Peter Martyr*'s Sermons and Lectures, his intimate Friend at *Oxford*, his Guest at *Strasborough* and *Zurich*, and his Assistant in compiling his Comment on *Judges*. In his Defence of his Apology, he saith, *That Christ by saying, it is finished, plainly signified*, persolutum jam esse precium pro peccato humani generis: By which the good Bishop sufficiently declared himself to be no friend to Popish Satisfactions. But what can hence be inferred, either for or against Calvinism? Did ever any Calvinist say, that Christ did not pay the whole price? or that God did expect any part of the price from the hands of any other? Ay, but it was paid for the sin of mankind. True; but not for the sin of every particular person of mankind; though if it had been so said by *Jewel*, many Calvinists would have liked *Jewel* the better for such a speech.

At length the Doctor hits upon one just of his mind, *viz.* Mr. *Samuel Harsnet*, who preached at *Paul's* Cross *Octob.* 27. 1584. and preached Anticalvinistically in all the five Points under Controversie; this must be granted him, if the Sermon were delivered as it was some few years since Printed. Hence he argues,

A Sermon preached at St. *Paul's*, at which no offence was taken, upon which no Recantation was enjoyned, nor any complaint made; had no matter in it contrary to the Rules of the Church, and the appointment of the same.

Mr. *Harsnet*'s Sermon was a Sermon preached at St. *Paul's*, &c. *ergo* it had no matter in it contrary to the Rules of the Church, &c.

Either the Doctor thinks the major of this Syllogism true, or he does not; if he does not, then can he have no confidence in his own Syllogism; if he do, then will it evidently follow, that in Calvinism there is nothing contrary to the Rules of the Church, because so many Calvinistical Sermons have been preached at *Paul's*, which were never complained of to Authority, nor any Recantation enjoyned upon them; yea, for which the Preachers have had thanks and preferments. Besides, if Mr. *Harsnet* had been complained of, and Recantation enjoyned him, the Doctor would not have accounted it the less Orthodox on that account; for he knows and will afterwards confess, that Recantation hath been enjoyned for such

such kind of Sermons as Mr. *Harsnet*'s was; so that I can scarce tell, whether it be worth while to descend to the minor of the former Syllogism; for what will it advantage us to prove, that the Sermon was Censured and Recanted, when as those we have to deal with, are resolved to think, that lawful Authority hath enjoyned Recantations of Sermons agreeable to the Articles of Religion? Yet because we are in *genere Historica*, I deny the minor; and say, it doth appear that offence was taken at the forementioned Sermon; that complaint was made of it, and that the Preacher did at least declare his sorrow for it; perhaps not heartily, for he seems to have lived and died an Arminian; yet he did declare his sorrow for the preaching of that his Sermon: had he not so done, the University no doubt had spewed him out; especially living in a Colledg where Dr. *Fulke* was Master, a man, that in his Answer to the *Remists*, hath thought himself as much concerned to vindicate the Doctrine of Election and Reprobation, and the Points thereupon depending, as any other Doctrine of our Reformation whatever. Doth any one ask me, how it appears that Mr. *Harsnet* and his Sermon was so censured and condemned? I answer, it appears from the plain testimony of Mr. *William Prin*, *page* 304. of his Perpetuity, Printed at such a time, when Prudence as well as Conscience would have restrained him from uttering an untruth against so great a man as *Harsnet* was then become? can it be imagined, that if this had been a slander, so great a Prelate of our Nation would not have demanded reparation and satisfaction? As for the Doctor's Argument, that seeing the Sermon was preached at the Cross, the University could take no cognizance of it; it is such, as I suppose upon second thoughts, he will wish he had never made use of. And he hath as much reason to wish, that he had never troubled his Book with any thing of Bishop *King*'s Lectures upon *Jonah*, in which nothing is to be found against absolute Predestination; nor yet any thing from which any probable collection can be made, that the Bishop had conceived in his own mind any opinion about it, contrary to Mr. *Calvin*'s; nor could the Doctor himself collect any thing from them, till he had first supposed, which no one will grant him, *that there is the same reason of God's eternal Election, and his Promises of his eternal Reprobation, and his threatnings.*

This

This done, the Historian fills his nineteenth Chapter with lamentations and weeping, bewailing the sad condition of the Church, that was fain in her Reformation under Queen *Elizabeth*, to make use of any Learned man, that had zeal against Popery, to discharge the places of greatest trust and Authority in the Church, how Calvinistical soever they were for Doctrine. But when was it the Church was put to this strait? was it not in the first years of Queen *Elizabeth*? and particularly in the year 1562. when the first Convocation was held? if so, what a piece of boldness was it to say, that that Convocation drew up Articles with any purpose to give check to Doctrinal Calvinism? and what uncharitableness is it to affirm, that our learned Divines did change their mind, when for a few years they were forced to change the air in the Reign of Queen *Mary*? what men of note had they to converse with beyond the Seas, whose Opinions and Arguments they had not read and considered while in *England*? they must needs be clouds without water, if the breath of *Calvin* and *Martyr* could so easily toss them to and fro. But we know, those that went over Conformists, came home Conformists; and those that went over Non-conformists, came back Non-conformists, though somewhat strengthened in their Non-conformity, by the communion they had with the Protestant Churches beyond the Seas. I shall hereafter shew, that not only Non-conforming Divines, but also the most zealous Conformists, did set themselves with all their might to declare against, and crush the Arminian Doctrine as soon as in any place it began to be delivered. And the Doctor may do well to remember, that Mr. *Hooper* and Mr. *Bradford*, whom he hath before made so much use of, though to little purpose, were both of them Non-conformists in King *Edward*'s days; and Mr. *Latimer*, whom he also challengeth for his own, was little better then a Non-conformist, letting fly sufficiently at the Dighities of the Reformed Prelates: So that if these three men had been as much for him, as he pretends, a man might say, English Arminianism did spring out of the root of Non-conformity; but it will appear, that it did spring from opposition to those wholesome Doctrines, in which all our Reformers, how much soever differing about Ceremonies, agreed.

Mr. *John Fox* his Martyrology, though dedicated to the Queen,

Queen, and by her accepted graciously, though highly honoured by a Canon of the whole Convocation, 1571. the Historian expressly saith, *he looketh on, as the first great Battery which was made on the Bulwarks of this Church, in point of Doctrine by any Member of her own*, page 58. A piece of confidence suitable to that which carried him to say, *King* Edward *was an ill principled Prince; and that his removal by death, was no infelicity of our Church.* And it is the more inexcusable, because in all his Histories about our Reformation, he lighteth his Candle so oft at the Martyrologists, it seems he loveth darkness rather then light, if it come from *Geneva*. Bishop *Hall*, to whom Episcopacy oweth far more then to Doctor *Heylin*, calleth *Fox* a *Saint-like Historian*; and for such he will be accounted, as long as any one drop of good Protestant blood runneth in our English veins. But did the Convocation appoint no balm for that wound made by the Martyrology? Yes, that it did, he thinks. What was it? Another Canon, *page* 60. "That men should "teach no other Doctrine in their publick Sermons to be be-"lieved of the People, but what was agreeable to the Do-"ctrine of the Old and New Testament, and had from "thence been gathered by the Catholick Fathers, and an-"cient Bishops. I say if this Canon had been observed, Mr. *Harsnet* had never preached his Sermon: he thinks Calvinism had never been preached, because maintained by none of the Catholick Fathers, and ancient Bishops, but Saint *Augustine* only, who was but one Bishop, but one Father. All Calvinists will now easily forgive him his reproaches against *Calvin*, seeing he spares not St. *Augustine*. But I hope he will not forgive himself that passion, which produced so great an untruth; had he said, none before St. *Augustine* maintained *Calvin*'s Doctrines, the mistake had been excusable; so is it not, to say, that no Catholick Father, or ancient Bishop, maintained it besides St. *Augustine*; doubtless *Prosper* and *Hilary* were both Catholick Fathers, and ancient Bishops, yet they as much maintained *Calvin*'s Opinions as St. *Augustine* doth. Who are the Bishops and Catholick Fathers, that the Doctor follows in these Points of Predestination and Grace? In his second Part, *page* 36. he quotes three ancient Writers; the first, *Ambrose* on the E-

 pistles;

pistles; yet every one knows, that those Commentaries on the Epistles are not his; but the work, as some think, of a Pelagian; as others, of one *Hilary*, no Bishop, though a Catholick. He also quotes the Commentary upon St. *Paul*'s Epistles ascribed to St. *Hierom*; but he is not ignorant (or if he be ignorant, few other Scholars be) that those Commentaries, however formerly fathered on *Hierom*, do call *Pelagius* himself Father; and he, I trow, was no Catholick Father, or ancient Bishop, but a most vile Heretick. He also refers us to St. *Chrysostom* in *Ep.* 14. by which I know not what he means; but am sure it is little credit to a Doctor in Divinity, living so near the University, to bring *Chrysostom* in Latine, whose Greek is so easie, as that School-boys are able to understand it; so that if this had been any piece of a Sermon, I might certainly have concluded, that the Doctor had violated the Canon; and would fain know of him, how our ordinary Country Preachers should be in any capacity to observe this Canon, whose Libraries scarcely afford a Father of any Edition to be trusted too? the best advice I can give them, is to buy such Books, as contain a Confession of Faith confirmed all along with Scriptures and Fathers; in which I cannot but commend the *Orthodoxus Consensus*, dedicated by *Gaspar Laurentius* to the Prince Elector *Palatine*, bound up with the *Corpus & Syntagma confessionum Fidei*, printed at *Geneva*, 1654. There is also published by *Cyril*, late Patriarch of *Constantinople*, a Confession of Faith, as Calvinstical as if it had been extracted out of *Calvin*'s own Institutions, which is now extant; confirmed all along by Scripture, and Fathers, Catholick and ancient, in a little Piece, put out by the learned *Hottinger*; where also there is enough said of *Cyril*'s life, troubles, and death, to free him from the aspersions cast on him, by the Jesuits, and by *Grotius*.

We have brought off Mr. *Fox*, and must now see, whether the Historian do charge Mr. *Perkins* with more success, of whom it is affirmed, *page* 62. "That he did open wider "the great breach that had been made by Mr. *Fox*. Sure it may easily be pardoned him, that he made that breach wider which was made by the Church it self, by putting so much honour upon the Acts and Monuments, as did, if we may believe this Doctor, manifestly tend to the subversion of that Doctrine,

x But wanty of Swedish Confession of God, or any of the rest printed Strasbury 1644

Doctrine, that she had about ten years before so solemnly gratified: But as it may well be presumed, that the Church would not consent to the picking out of her own eyes, so we have great reason to think, that Mr. *Perkins* did design all his Treatises, only to commend that milk unto others, which he had, with so much delight and nourishment, sucked from the Brests of his Mother, the Reformed Church of *England*. The Treatise of his quarrelled at, is called *Armilla Aurea*, composed by the Author in Latine, translated into English by Dr. *Robert Hill*, *at the request of* Perkins *himself*, (saith our Historian) but tells us not whence he had that information; nor indeed is it probable, that Mr. *Perkins* would request another to do a work that might easily be done, and yet could be done so well by no hand as his own: The Translator tells us plainly, in his Epistle Dedicatory unto the Judg of the Admiralty Court, *that he made the Translation at the request of some well disposed, that his own Country men might by it reap some profit.* And perhaps also, he had a design to reap some profit by his Country men, presaging that it would be of very quick sale, as indeed it hapned, being Printed fifteen times in the space of twenty years. Many of the greatest learning and judgment, thought this left-handed *Ehud* did by this his Book, wound the Pelagian Cause to the very heart. Our Historian thinks not so, and tells us *page 64. that it found not like welcome in all places, nor from all hands.* *Parsons* the Jesuite is brought in thus sleighting him, *by the deep humour of fancy, he hath published and writ many Books with strange Titles, which neither he, nor his Reader do understand; as namely, about the Concatenation, or laying together of the causes of mans Predestination and Reprobation.* And then *Jacob van Harmin*, he acquaints us, wrote *a full discourse against it.* I know not what he means by it, *Arminius* his Examen, as we all know, being not designed against *Perkins* his *Armilla Aurea*, but against another Piece called a Treatise of Predestination, and of the largeness of of God's grace; and that Examen of *Arminius* hath been so confuted by the learned Dr. *Twiss*, that no Remonstrant hath as yet had confidence enough to rejoyn. All the wind hitherto sent from the Doctor, hath shaken no corn; we can contemn *Parsons*, and not value *Arminius*; he therefore fur-

ther acquaints us, *page 65.* of a very sharp censure passed upon Mr. *Perkins*, by the Doctor of the Chair in *Oxford*; What is this censure? no more, but that Mr. *Perkins*, otherwise a learned and pious Person, (therefore surely able to understand the Title of his own Books) did err no light error, *in making the subject of Divine Predestination, to be man considered before the fall*; adding also further, *that some by undertaking to defend Mr.* Perkins *in this opinion, had given unnecessary trouble to the Church.* This censure is very gentle, in comparison of what the same Reverend and Learned Professor, afterwards Bishop of *Salisbury*, thought meet to pass upon *Arminius*, *Bertius*, and all their Followers, whom he accuseth *of most detestable Sacriledg.* The same Doctor had before undertaken a Defence of Mr. *Perkins* his Reformed Catholick, *calling him a man of very commendable quality, and well deserving, for his great travel and pains for the furtherance of true Religion, and edifying of the Church.* Which Reformed Catholick also is learnedly defended by Mr. *Wotton.* For a parting blow, the Doctor tells us that Mr. *Perkins scarce lived out half his days*; and that *in the pangs of death, he spake nothing so articularly, as Mercy, mercy; which he hopes God did graciously grant him in that woful agony:* And I for my part, do not at all doubt that God shewed him mercy, and had shewed him the very riches of his mercy many years before; for God is not unrighteous, that he should forget that labour of love with which Mr. *Perkins* had laboured in *Cambridg*; as little do I doubt that there are hundreds in Heaven blessing that Providence, that placed a light so shining and burning in that University; his dying so soon is not to be imputed to his blood-thirstiness, or deceitfulness, but to his hard studies and unwearied diligence, which must needs waste his natural spirits, and bring him sooner to his grave then he would have come, if he could have satisfied himself (as some do) to enter into the Pulpit no oftner, then the High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies. He always desired that he might die praying for the pardon of sin, and he had his desire. If he pronounced the word Damned with a more then ordinary Emphasis, it was only to forewarn his Hearers to flee from the wrath to come; if he so pressed the Law, as to make the hair of the young Scholars stand upright, it was only

only, that being awakened out of their security, they might seriously ask the question, how they should do to be saved? The Law was designed to be a School-master to bring us to Christ, and would not have that effect, if it should not be preached with some of that terror, with which it was at first delivered; but *he made the infinitely greatest part of all mankind uncapable of God's grace and mercy, by an absolute and irrespective decree of Reprobation*, so it is said *page 66.* but no such thing can be proved out of his writings; had he framed any such decree as made any one man or woman uncapable of grace and mercy, he must needs have affrighted away his Disciples and Hearers, which he was so far from doing, that Historian himself confesseth, that by means of him, and Dr. *Whitaker*, the University had been quite over run with Calvinism, had not Dr. *Baro*, a French-man born, set himself to pluck up what the other two had planted and watered. Of this Dr. *Baro* we shall now hear the Historian tell us a fine tale; *Scilicet liberanda veritas expectabat liberatorem Petrum Baro*; the English Kingdom of Heaven had fallen, had it not been for this Atlas that bare it up with his shoulders. Let us see what the man was, and what he held, that we may know how much we owe unto him; which yet we cannot well do, till we have taken in our way the story of one *Barret*, who in a Sermon *ad Clerum*, *April* 29. 1595. had vented sundry Anticalvinistical Points, for which he was convented *May* 5. before the Heads of Houses, and charged to have preached Doctrines erroneous and false, and contrary to the Religion received and established by publick Authority in the Realm of *England*; he confessed the Doctrines charged upon him, but denied them to be any way repugnant to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; whereupon the Vice Chancellor and forenamed Heads, entring into mature deliberation, and diligently weighing and examining these Positions, because it did manifestly appear, that the said Positions were false, erroneous, and likewise repugnant to the Religion received and established in the Church of *England*, adjudged and declared, that the said *Barret* had incurred the penalty of the 45th Statute of the University, *de Concionibus*, and by vertue and tenour of that Statute, they decreed and adjudged the said *Barret* to make a publick Recantation, in

such words and form, as by the Vice-Chanceller, and the said Heads, or any two or three of them, should be prescribed unto him; or else upon his refusal to recant, to be perpetually expelled both from his Colledg and the University; what the form of Recantation was, may be seen in Mr. *Prin*; such it was, as gave sufficient honour unto *Calvin*, *Peter Martyr*, and the Doctrines Preached and Printed by them. Lo here we have those that were always entrusted with power to judge of, and to condemn false Doctrine, condemning the *Anti-Calvinistical* opinions as false and contrary to the Articles of of Religion established in *England*, and when such an Authority has laid a Recantation upon Mr. *Barret*, how will Dr. *H.* get it off? Why First. He doubts whether any Recantation were enioyned in so many words as are extant in Mr. *Prin*: this is an irrational doubt, seeing Mr. *Prin* had the transcript under the University Registers own hand. Secondly. He denies it as a thing most false that ever *Barret* published any Recantation whatsoever it was, and yet Mr. *Prin*, tells him that he had a transcript taken out of an Original copy under Mr. *Barrets* own hand; and tells us, as also does Mr. *Fuller*, what words he used after he had read the Recantation: and words from which it might be inferd, that he was not heartily sorry for the errors delivered by him, nor really changed in his judgment. But doth it not appear by a letter of the Heads of Houses dated *March*, 8. that Mr. *Barret* had never made any such Recantation? I answer it doth not appear, for the Heades of Houses say not that he had never read the Recantation, but that he had refused to doe it in such sort as was prescribed, which might make those who were in Authority in the University, both to mind him of his duty, and also to complaine of him unto their Chancellour for not doing his duty; yet if it will doe the Dr. a kindness let him enjoy his fancy, that Mr. *Barret* Recanted not, for to be sure he did not credit his Recantation, returning to Arminianisme and also to Popery, unto which the Heads of Houses say Arminianisme had been by sundry made a Bridge: however here is the judgment of the Heads of Houses in *Cambridge* solemnly declared, that he who strikes at Mr. *Calvin* in these points, strikes at the Church of *England* also, "Yea sayes the Dr, but it will not hence follow that

Barrets

"*Barrets* Doctrines were repugnant to the Church of *Eng-*
"*land*, because these Heades judged them so, for if so we
"may conclude by the same Argument, that the Church of
"*Rome* was in Light in the Darkest times of ignorance and
"superstition, because all that publickly opposed her Doctrin
"were injoyned Recantation; which evasion is so lamentable,
that he had much better have used none; for we doe not from
the injoyning of the Recantation inferr the falsity of the
Doctrines to be recanted, but only their dissonance unto the
Religion established, and certainly the Church of *Rome*: when
it was at the worst, did never injoyne Recantation of any
Doctrine which was not contrary unto her present sentiments,
and so I leave Mr. *Barret* and his opinions under the blot
justly dropped upon them by the University, only taking
notice that *Barrets* perrempterinesse might occasion *Baro* to
deliver his mind more plainly and publickly then before he
had done, which occasioned the University to send up Dr.
Whitaker and Dr. *Tindall* unto *Arch* Bp. *Whitgift*, hoping
hoping that he who had been so zealous against *Cartwright*
in a point of Discipline, would he found to have some zeale
against *Baro* in matter of Doctrine: nor did their hopes
fail them, for he forthwith called to him sundry right worthy
and Reverend Divines, and drew up those Articles com-
monly called the *Lambeth* Articles, agreed upon *November*,
the 10. 1595. Nine they are in number, and were approved
by the *Arch* Bp. of *York*, as well as by his Grace of *Canter-*
bury, so that here are the two *Metropolitans*, men no doubt
considerable for Learning as well as for authority, for both
of them had been Lady *Margret* and Kings professors in the
University. Now I aske did these know the Doctrine of the
Church or did they not. If they did not how durst they call
men to subscribe what they knew not: if they did then either
calvinisme in this matter is the Doctrine of the Church,
or else the two Primates commended to the University, a
Doctrine against their own Light and conscience; and it is
worth observation that the Bp. of *York* in his letter to his
Brother of *Canterbury*, does give him to understand, that
his opinion he sent him concerning Election and Reprobation,
was but that in which they had both agreed while they pro-
fessed and taught Divinity in the Schoolcs; nor can it be

said that *Whitgift* received his opinion from beyond the Seas, where he never was; having such favour shewed him by Dr. *Perne*, that he never needed to leave the Kingdome: more probable it is that he suckt in these opinions from his Tutor Mr. *Bradford*, and from Bp. *Ridley* Master of Pembroke Hall, whilst he was a Fresh-man. By whom also he was so principled against the tyranny and Detestable enemities of the Pope, that at the time of his commencing Dr. In Divinity, he gave this Thesis to be disputed on, *Papa est Antichristus*. Wherefore let not the Historian spend time to prove that those Articles, doe not binde the Church as those did that solemnly passed in the Convocations, for I ascribe no such Authority to them, only urge them as Declarations of the Articles of our Religion, just as I would urge the judgement of the two Lord Chiefe Justices, calling in to their assistance others learned in the Law, for the expounding of a Statute, tis not impossible they should be mistaken in their expcsition, but it would be strongly presumed by all modest men, that they were not mistaken; and so I could let goe these Articles, had it not pleased the Historian to tell us, *of a mighty offence taken at them by the Lord Burleigh, and a resolution of having all that acted in them attainted of a præmunire; from the danger of which the Arch* Bishop *could not get release, until he had promised speedily to recall and suppress those Articles*, all which we have laid down, *Pag.* 81, 82. as things affirmed by Mr. *Mountague*, from the Remonstrants in an answer of theirs, published, 1618. but where did these Remonstrants here this story? *why possibly they might have it from the mouth of* Baro, *or some other Cambridge men.* Will any man believe so great things upon so slender proofes, as the possibility of the Remonstrants hearing there from the mouth of some Cantabridgian, when they do not so much as prerend to have heard any such thing from any member of our Church? nor doth any one ever since offer to tell us when and where the *Arch* Bishop was forced to make any such submission. the Heads of Houses in their letter the Lord *Burleigh, own the sending up of* Dr. *Tindall, and* Dr. *Whitaker, to conferr with the Lord of Canterbury, and write of the great and comfortable quiet, that by the comming downe of the Articles, was brought unto the University until that* Baro *in* January *following contrary to restraint*

restraint and commandment, gave some new disturbance. In the same letter also subscribed with their names, and bearing date, *March*, 8. 1595. *they resolutely tell the same Lord, that* Baro *had determined, preached, Printed diverse points of Doctrine, not only contrary to himself, but also contrary to that which had been taught and received ever since his Majesty's reigne and agreeable to the errours of Popery: wherefore they pray his Lordship to vouchsafe his good ayd, and advise to the comfort of themselves and all others of the University truly affected, and to the suppression, in time of those errours and even of gross Popery, like by such meanes to creep in among them. And upon this letter, something else,* Baro *left* his place in the University because he could not keep it says Dr. *Ward*, Mr. *Fuller*, and all other Cantabridgians that ever I read: but this Oxford Historian who can easily affirm any thing that he much desires, tells us he left his place, neither because *he was deprived, nor because he had any fear of being deprived, but meerly because, he had no mind to keep it any longer: nay he sticks not to affirm that in case it had pleased him to continue any longer Lecturer, it is probable he might have carried the Lecture from any other Candidate, or Competitour of what rate soever*; but by what mediums hid he being himself to this probable persuasion or whence did he collect that he had so great a number of adherents, only from Dr. *Overals* being chosen to succeeds Dr. *Whitaker*. But if they were the Anti-calvinists that carried it for *Ov*[illegible] why did they not rather carry it for *Baro* himself? seeing they had such fair presidents of preferring those who are Lady *Margarets* Professours to be Kings Professours? *Hutton* had been so preferred, so had *Whitgift*, so had *Chaderton*: or if *Baro's* interest were so great, how came he to use so little care and Conscience as not to provide a Successour of his own mind; did he think his opinions were not worth the knowing; if he did not why did he trouble the world with them? if he did, why would he so tamely yeild to the Chusing of Dr. *Playford*, then whom there was not a man in all the University more opposite to him. The truth is Dr. *Overald* had not then declared himself to differ from *Calvin*, and therefore was by the University employed to Convince *Barret*, and afterwards when he delivered such things as some Calvinists condemned him for, yet he never deliverd his mind so, as to deny personal election or the certain perseverance

of

of all the elect; something more of his mind we shall hear hereafter, in the Hampton-Court-Conference.

In the mean time I must mind the Dr. of a certain Catechisme, consisting of Questions and Answers touching the Doctrine of predestination bound up with our English *Bibles* Printed by *Robert Barker*, Anno 1607. but not then first bound up with our *Bibles* as the Dr. seemes willing to think, *Pag.* 101, 102. the Questions and Answers are to be found in the Church *Bibles* commonly called the Bishops *Bibles*, Printed by *Christopher Barker*. I my self have seen *Bibles* Printed 20. Years before the comming in of K. *James*, in which they were, and for ought I know they were as old as any Translation of the *Bible* used in Queen *Elizabeths* time. He askes by what authority those questions and answers were put in betwixt the Old and new Testament, and so I remember he somewhere askes by what Authority the Metrical Translation of the *Psalmes*, was allowed to be Sung in Churches; I am not able to give him a satisfactory answer either to the one or the other question, no more then he is able to answer me who made our *second* Book of Homilies? yet he thinkes I suppose that those who made that Book were Authorized to make it, and so do I think that those who first bound up those Questions and Answers and Singing *Psalmes* with our *Bibles*, had Order and Authority so to doe.

All this while *Cambridge* hath took us up: we must now look into the other University, in which we are told that all things *were calm and quiet, no publick opposition shewing it self, in the Schooles or Pulpits.* the reason of this quiet, is, guessed at, *because the Students of that University did more incline to the canvasing of such Points as were in difference betwixt us, and Romanists; for witness he calls in many Papists, and on the other side* Bp. *Jewell*, Bp. *Bilson*, Dr. *Humphry*, Mr. *Nowel*, Dr. *Sparks*, Dr. *Reynolds*, and many others *which stood firme to the Church of England.* This last clause sure Slipped from him unawares, upon second thoughts I feare he will scarce affirme that all these stood firme to the Church of *England*, if they did, no lot or portion hath he or any of his in the Church of *England*, most of them having declared their minds point blank against conditional electi-

on

on, &c. *Jewell* hath told us his mind about Election in his comment on the *Thessalonians*, so hath Mr. *Nowel* in his Catechisme, Dr. *Humphries* in the life of *Jewell* &c. This nevertheless I grant that in Queen *Elizabeths* time there were no disputings, *ex animi sententiâ*, against Calvinisme in Oxford Schooles, no Oxford man during her Reign declared himself for conditional decrees or any thing else opposite to Mr. *Calvin* in those points; but many did as they had occasion declare themselves strenuously for *Calvin* in Queen *Elizabeths* dayes; we find the whole convocation appointing *Calvins* Institutions to be read by Tutors unto their Pupils and other Books also as calvinistical as the Institutions can be, by which means our Divines became prepared against the adversary as soon as he should dare to shew himself. *Anno* 1597. *Robert Abbot* proceeded Doctor and being alarummed from *Cambridge* gave these two Theses, *Æternâ Dei predestinatione continetur aliorum electio ad vitam æternam, aliorum ad mortem reprobatio. Electorum certa est salus, ut perire non possint.* Dr. *Field (qualis & quantus vir)* 1598. gave these *Theses*, *Doctrina Prædestinationis olim tradita ab* Augustino, *& nostris temporibus à* Calvino *eadem est, nec quicquam continet Catholicæ veritati aut Fidei regulæ contrarium. Præscientia Dei æterno decreto omnia ordinantis non pugnavit cum arbitrii libertate primis parentibus concessa. Orthodoxi Patres qui liberum arbitrium esse dixerunt, & qui hodie servum esse docent, idem sentiunt.* Five such *Theses* as these, laid down by two such Scholars, were enough to let the new *Pelagianizers* see there was no quarter for them in *Oxford*, nor can I find that they sought any; *Calvin* being there all Qu. *Elizabeths* days, in as much honour as at *Geneva*: and of this the Historian seems sensible, confessing that even *Barnabas* was carried away into Calvinisme, only he labours to prove that it was but one point, that of the not total or final falling away of Gods Elect; and that is indeed the only point for which Mr. *Hooker* was quoted: but this is such a point as with which the other are necessarily twisted, and so defended by him as that he appears Calvinistical to the utmost, for whereas there be that maintain the certain perseverence of only the Elect, judging it not impossible that some might be believers who were not Elect, *Hooker* plainly makes

makes all true believers Elect to eternal life, and therefore sure to persevere in the Faith, and he is so confident in this point as in none more, profaning his assertion thus; *in this I am sure I am not deceived, nor can I decieve you.* At last the Doctor is faign to fly to this ἀποφύγειν, *that his discourse of justification might be altered by the publisher of it, or it might be written by him as an Essay of his younger yeares*, Pag. 90. had he not better have said it is true that *Hooker* also was a Doctrinal Calvinist, but I could heartily wish he had not been such.

What then will the Doctor let go the whole Uuiversity of *Oxford*? no *Ibid.* "Some therefore who spared not to "declare their dislike of the Calvinian tenents, and secretly "trained up their Scholars in other Points. An answer that may indifferently serve for any novellists by what soever name dignified or distinguished, the absurd *Quakers* may say that there have been in the University, many that never bowed their Knees to *Baal*, and thereupon charge flesh to be silent and not object singularity to them; and they may further add that sundry great Scholars, will be as free to joyne with them as *Buckeridge*, and *Houson*, were to joyne with *Mountague*, if ever there come a time in which it shall be no more hazardous to own their friends, then it was in, 1626. to own *Mountague*. There is onely one thing in which the Doctor can hope to out shoot them. "and that is this that "Bp. *Bancroft* when *Baro*, died at *London*, three or foure "Yeares after his leaving Cambridge, took Order to have "most of the Divines in and about *London* to attend his "Funeral, this plainly shews thinks he, that there were many "of both Universities that openly favoured *Baroes* Doctrines "*Pag*, 90. But do we indeed favour and plainly declare that we favour the opinions, of those whose Funeralls we attend; if so then must we never go to the Funeral of a Roman Catholick, then did Queen *Elizabeth* and her Bishop *Grindal* plainly discover themselves friends to Popery when they so magnificently celebrated the Funerals of the Emperour.

Besides the Historian would do well to consider that when the Prophet *Eliah* thought himself to be alone, Israel was manifestly apostatized from the God of her Fathers, and

and had committed Whoredom with *Idols*: and so in *Athanasius* his time the world was become *Arrian*. If the Doctor also will grant that in Queen *Elizabeths* time the Church was become Calvinistical, he grants the very thing we are contending for, as for the truth of the Calvinistical opinions that we are ready to try with him by Scripture when he pleaseth, in this History we search not what ought to be held, but what hath been held, not of what mind our reformers should have been, but of what they were. If *Calvinisme* be truth, it will be truth, though it had never found entertainement in the Church of *England*, if it be error, it will be error though all the Church of *England* be for it, for the Church cannot make truth or falsehood, but only declare what is truth and falsehood. Whether the Church have declared Calvinisme or Anti-calvinisme to be truth, that is the only present *ζητημα*, Seeing we have found Anti-calvinisme discountenanced by the Church, in Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, let us now follow the Historian to her successors dayes, that we may see whether it were more countenanced then.

The first thing we are led to *Pag.* 96, 97, 98, 99, 100. is the *Hampton* Court conference, in which he shall find nothing for him, but much against him. Dr. *Reynolds* calls the *Lambeth* Articles Orthodoxal, no one intimated that they were Heterodoxal, Dr. *Overal* declares against the total and final Apostasy of the Saints, no one declared for it. His Majesty determined, that *Predestination and Election, depend not upon any Qualities, actions, or works of Men, which be mutable, but upon Gods Eternal and immutable decree and purpose, no one said or whispered any thing against it.* "Tis only said, that the Bishop of *London* told his Majesty "how very many in these our dayes, neglecting Holiness of "life presumed too much of persisting in grace, (Calvinists "would say such fellows never had grace to persist in) laying "all their religion on predestination, if I shall be saved I "shall be saved, which he termed a desperate Doctrine, "(and so the Calvinists terme it also an hundred times "over) shewing it to be contrary to good Divinity, and "the true Doctrine of predestination, wherein we should "rather reason *ascendendo* then *descendendo*, thus, I live in

"obedience

"obedience to God, in love to my Neighbor, I follow my "occasion, and therefore I trust God hath elected me and "predestinated me to eternal Salvation: not thus which is "the usual course of argument, God hath predestinated, and "chosen me to life, therefore though I sin never so grievously, "yet I shall not be damned, for whom he once loveth, he "loveth to the End.

In which words there is some thing *Hypercalvinistical*, for the Bishop saith, we must rather reason *ascendendo* then *descendendo*; but the Calvinist saith, that we must altogether reason *ascendendo*, not at all *descendendo*, in such away as he after delineats. If the Bishop were not a Calvinist, I would fain know how a man could according to his principles, argue *ascendendo*, I live in obedience to God, therefore I trust God hath elected me and predestinated me to Salvation. The Calvinist saith, he that lives in obedience to God is predestinated to Salvation, but so doth not the Anti-calvinist, nor hath he any foundation to build his trust of predestination to Salvation upon; for according to him a man who lives in all good obedience to God may be damned, because he may cease to live in obedience to God, and hath no promise that he shall not cease.

But if Dr. *Bancroft* had not by this speech declared himself Calvinistical, yet as hath been said, his Chaplaines publishing his Exposition, or *Analysis*. of our Articles, according to the Calvinistical frame and that with his good likeing and approbation, is a sufficient argument that he was such, to invalidate this argument it is only said, *that Analysis had been published*, 1585. *which was eighteen yeares before Bancroft was Arch-bishop*; which answer addes strength to the argument, for by it, it appeares that he took one to be his Chaplaine, who had Eighteen yeares before published a Calvinistical exposition of the Articles, and suffered him, after his own consecration to republish it, and to dedicate it to his own grace, which it may be presumed he would not have done, if it had contained any thing contrary to his own judgment and sense.

But why would any one affirme, that *Bancroft* agreed to the *Lambeth* Articles, whilest Bishop of *London*? Answer; it was Mr. *Fullers* mistake in his Church History, so to affirme

Mr.

no mistake at all for he

Mr. *Hickman*, whom the Doctor hath chosen for his adversary, never so affirmed, yet he affirmed, that he agreed to them, and so it is like he did, in the capacity of a Divine called in to consult, on which score I also reckon that Mr. *Nowel* Dean of St. *Pauls* might agree to them, because he was Dr. *Whitakers* Unkle and resided at *London*. Object. 2. Did not King *James* reject those *Lambeth* Articles, when propounded as fit to be inserted into the Articles. Answer; he did not reject them, nor could he in honour reject them, having never seen them before, nor having them read to him at that time: he was only told that the Articles were by the Arch-Bishop, taking to him some Divines of special note drawn up, and sent to the University for the appeasing of quarrels whereupon his Majesty resolved, *that when such questions do arise amongst Scholars, the quietest proceeding, were to determine them in the University, and not to stuff the Book with Conclusions Theological.* Here is not one word of leaving them to be canvased and disputed in the Schooles, though if they had been so left, they might not be held in the *Affirmative* or *Negative*, as best pleased the Respondent, for the Respondent in our Universities can hold nothing without the allowance and approbation of the Doctor of the Chaire, or Vice-chancelor, or University. Yea King *James* did some Yeares after, allow the putting of these *Lambeth* Articles into the confession of the Church of *Ireland*, Anno 1615. To this the Doctor shapes an answer, *Pag.* 101. consisting of sundry particulars.

First, *That the Irish Articles were drawn up by Dr.* Usher *a professed Calvinist, who not only thrust in the* Lambeth *Articles, but also made others of his own.* Answer, the Articles are the better to be liked because drawn up by a hand so learned and peaceable. Second, *That the King might give consent to the confirming of these Articles, though he liked them not.* How so?

First, *Because the Irish Nation, at that time, were most tenaciously addicted to the errors and corruptions of the Church of* Rome, *and therefore must be bended to the other extreme, before they could be streight.* Secondly, *It was an usual practise with the King in the whole course of his government, to ballance one extreme by another, countenancing the Papists against the*

the Puritaines, and the Puritanes sometimes against the Papists. Answer, I have heard much talk of the craft of King *James*, but did never before here, nor do I now believe, that this was any part of it; for what Policy is it to bring People out of one extreme into another? or what piety is it to agree to Articles of Religion, the which all the Clergy must approve, merely to keep the civil interest even. But I see what the Doctors fetch is in this, what ever King *James* did in the affaires of Religion that his palat relisheth not, must be thought to be done to gratifie the Puritans, may not the Puritans also say, that what ever was done pleasing to the Doctor, was done in compliance with the Papists? and with whom then will the name of King *James* be precious, or honourable?

One piece of veracity I must needs commend the Doctor for, his acknowledging that Dr. *Reynolds* owned the meaning of the sixteenth Article to be sound, Pag. 98. this I commend because Mr. *Mountague*, found a forhead, in his Appeale, to aver that it was by him and the other Ministers *challenged for unsound.* I wish I had the like occasion to commend him for veracity to the end of his Book, but I have not, for Pag. 103. he tells us, *that the opposites to the Calvinians, were by the grace and favour of King* James *invested in the chief preferments of the Church of* England, *conferred as openly and freely upon them as those who had been bred up in the contrary perswasion.* This if it be understood of men that had openly declared their opinions against the Calvinian Doctrin, will be found to be an untruth, if any truth be to be given to our Printed Catalogues of Bishops. there were in that Kings Reign these Translations, or Consecrations.

Canterbury, *Richard Bancroft*, 1604. *G. Abbot*, 1610. Asaph, *Richard* Parry, 1604. *John Hanmer*, 1622. Bangor, *Lewis Bailie*, 1616. Bath and Wells, *James* Mountague, 1608. *Ar. Lake*, 1616. Bristoll, *John Thornborough*, 1603. *Nicholas Felton*, 1617. *John Scachfield*, 1619. *Robert Wright*, 1622. Chicester, *Lancelot Andrews*, 1605. *Samuel Harsnet*, 1609. *George Carleton*, 1619. Coventry, *George Abbot*, 1609. *Richard Neile*, 1610. *John Overald*, 1614. *Thomas Morton*, 1618. St. Davids, *Richard Milborne*, 1615. *William Laud*, 1621.

1621. Ely, *Lancelot Andrews*, 1609. *Nicholas Felton*, 1618. Exeter, *Valentine Cary*, 1621. Glocester, *Thomas Ravis*, 1604. *Henry Parry*, 1607. *Giles Thomson*, 1611. *Miles Smith*, 1612. Hereford, *Francis Godwin*, 1617. Landaff, *George Carleton*, 1618. *Theo: Field*, 1619. Lincoln, *William Barlow*, 1608. *Richard Neile*, 1613. *George Mountayn*, 1617. *John Williams*, 1621. London, *Richard Vaughan*, 1604. *Thomas Ravis*, 1607. *George Abbot*, 1609. *John King*, 1611. *George Mountaine*, 1621. Norwich, *John Overal*, 1618. *Samuel Harsnet*, 1619. Oxford, *John Bridges*, 1603. *John Howson*, 1619. Rock; *William Barlow*, 1605. *Richard Neile*, 1608. *Jo: Buckyridge*, 1611. Salsbury, *Robert Abbot*, 1615. *Martin Fotherby*, 1618. *Robert Tomson*, 1620. *John Davenant*, 1621. Winchester; *Ja: Mountague*, 1617. *Lancelot Andrews*, 1618. Worc. *Henry Parry*, 1610. *John Thornborough*, 1617. Yorke, *Toby Matthew*, 1606. Carlisle, *Robert Snowdon*, 1616. *Richard Milbourne*, 1620. *Richard Senhouse*, 1624. Chester, *George Lloyd*, 1604. *Thomas Morton*, 1616. *John Bridgman*, 1618. Durham, *William James*, 1606. *Richard Neile*, 1617.

How few are they among these which the Doctor hyes claime to? and how little or no proofe doth he give us that those whom he claimes, had publickly owned any of his Anti-calvinian opinions? *Bancroft* is never affirmed to have said or written any thing concerning predistination, but what occurs in the Relation of the *Hampton* Court conference, and that can at most amount but to a rebuke of some carnal Protestants, who did abuse the Doctrine of predestination to their own destruction.

Overall's opinion in these points, if it somewhat differ from *Calvins*, much more differs from Dr. *Heylins*, yet on the account of *Overall*'s, and some others Episcopal preferments, the Historian groweth so confident, as to averr that his conditional, decree, men *found King* James *a gracious Patron, and by meanes of his gracious Patronage, in the end surmounted all difficulties, and came at last to be altogether as considerable, both for power and number, as the Calvinists were.*

He that will affirm this, and affirm it in Print, and

whilst so many are living that knew the Transactions of King *James* his Court, must needs loose the credit of an impartial Historian. Yet the Doctor as if he had not sufficiently disparaged himself in affirming so great an increase of Anti-calvinists in *England*, goes on to give a reason of it, just as some in natural philosophy undertake to give us a cause of the Swans singing before her death, before they have given us any good Authority that she doth so sing: but what is his reason? "why the diffe-"rences betwixt Remonstrants and Contraremonstrants, "in *Holland* and their publishing of their Books one a-"gainst another, by which the students in the University "were quickned to study the points. That the breaking out of the Remonstrants could not, did not contribute to the increase of Arminianisme in *England*, we shall see by and by; in the meane time it is no great credit to the Doctors cause, that so few durst publickly appear for it, till it had the incouragement of the civil Magistrate. If the primitive Christians had not published the truth before Kings became nursing Fathers to it, the world had been to this day under Paganish darkness; let me offer a *Dilemma*, Either there were some in *England* who thought Calvins Doctrines made God the Author of sin, destroyed liberty of will, opened a gap to all profaneness, or there were not; if there were none, every one sees what will follow, if any how came they to have so little zeale against so damnable blasphemies, as not to adventure the loss of all preferments, yea, of life it self in opposing of them.

Dr. H. Page 104.

"But it so hapned that while matters went thus fairely "forwards *Conradus Vorstius*, suspected for a *Samosetanian* "or *Sorinian* Heretick, &c. was chosen by the Curators "of *Leiden*, 1611. to succeed Arminius.

Answer, While things went thus fairely forward, how fairely forward? you told us before of the preferments of certain Bishops that had espoused your opinions several of

of whose preferments were bestowed on them after this election of *Vorstius*, into the place of Arminius. You also little credit your History, by saying that *Vorstius* was but suspected of Socinianisme, and your friends the Remonstrants did less credit themselves in appearing so strenuously for a man suspected of such prodigious blasphemies, if he had been only suspected. But what ever secret good liking you had either for the Remonstrants or *Vorstius*, by whom they would faign have been headed, your Loyalty and Alleageance, should have kept you from saying that King *James* used *many harsh and bitter expressions against Arminius and his followers, as if guilty of the same impieties with Vorstius*; for why might not King *James*, charge the Remonstrants with *Vorstius* his blasphemies when as they so apertly declared, *that they had nothing against Vorstius, nor had found any thing in his Writing which was contrary to truth or piety, and that it would be most profitable to Church and Commonwealth, if his calling should proceed. Vid praef. ad acta Synodi.*

But how inexcuseable a piece of — is it to say as you doe, *Cap.* 6th. *Numb.* 7. that King *James was carried so to express himself, against the Arminians, not so much by the clear light of his own understanding, as by reason of State, and that it was a part of Kings craft, to contribute to the suppression of the weaker party.* For doth not King *James* in his Declaration tell you the clean contrary? doth he not also call *Arminius an enemy to God*, his followers *Atheistical sectaries*? doth he not call *Pertius* his Book of the Apostasy of Saints, *a blasphemous Book, worthy of the Fire for its very Title*; doth he not say that *Pertius*, *lied grosely in averring his heresy, contained in his said Book, was agreeable with the profession and Religion, of out Church of England?*

And will you after all this make the world believe that setting aside political considerations, and a designe to serve the Prince of *Orange*, he had no zeal against Arminianismes, what if one should say that this Book you have written is not the clear result of your Judgment, but wrested from you by the importunity of your friends, who would not suffer you to be quiet, till you had reproached

the Calvinists, and wrested the History of Church affaires to serve their end? you would think your self wronged. And have not you then much more wronged King *James*, under whose Goverment you lived, in telling the world so long after his death, that he put all the harsh expressions against Arminius, into his Declaration to *serve other mens turnes, rather then to advance his own* as you speak *Chap*, 22. *Numb*, 10. But you think you have reason to charge this hypocrisy on him, for say you, *Pag*. 106. *That King* James *condemned not the Arminians Doctrines in themselves, though he had taken some displeasure against their persons, appeares not only by rejecting the* Lambeth *Articles, and his dislike to the Calvinian Doctrine of predestination in the conference at* Hamton *Court, but also by instructing his Divines commissionated for the Synod of* Dort, *not to oppose the Article of Universal Redemption, which they accordingly performed.* You told us before *Chap*, 6. *Numb*, 7th. that King James *sent such Divines to the assembly at* Dort, *as he was sure would be sufficiently active in their*, (i. e. the Remonstrants) *condemnation*, and have you now so soone forgot your self, as to say that he instructed his Divines thither commissionated not to oppose the Article of Universal redemption, which accordingly they performed; and make this an argument that King *James*, condemned not the Arminian Doctrines in themselves. Was that Uuiversal redemption which you say King *James* instructed his Divines not to oppose, and which they did not oppose an Arminian Doctrine, or was it not, if it was not, how is King *James* his directing his Divines not to oppose it any evidence that he condemned not the Arminians opinion in themselves? if it were, and that our Divines did not condemn it, why is the King charged with sending Divines, that would be sufficiently active in condemning the Arminian opinions?

Again you say expressly, *Pag*, 107. *That he gave command to his Divines, sent to the Synod of* Dort, *not to recede from the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *in the point of Universal Redemption by the death of Christ; a point so inconsistent with that of the absolute decree of reprobation, and generally of the whole* Machina *of predestination*

predestination and the points depending thereupon, as they are commonly maintained in the Schooles of Calvin, that fire and water cannot be at greater difference.

Sir, I beseech you consider whether you do not contradict your self, whilst you think you only contradict Calvin. Universal redemption by the death of Christ overthrowes the whole *Machine*, of the Calvinian predestination and the points thereon depending. Thus I argue from this.

They that were sent with Order to assert Universal redemption by the death of Christ, were sent with order to destroy the whole *Machine* of Calvinian predestination.

Our Divines by King *James*, were sent with Orders to assert Universal redemption by the death of Christ.

Therefore our Divines were sent with Orders to destroy the whole *Machine* of Calvinian predestination.

Againe, They that asserted Universal redemption by the death of Christ destroyed the whole *Machine* of the Calvinian predestination.

Our Divines at the Synod of *Dort*, asserted Universal Redemption by the death of Christ.

Therefore our Divines at the Synod of *Dort*, destroyed the whole *Machine* of the Calvinian predestination.

The premises in both Syllogismes are your own, yet I suppose you disown the conclusion, naturally and necessarily flowing from them; or if you do not, why did you say that our King thought it a piece of King Craft to contribute to the suppression of the weaker, *i. e.* Remonstrant party, and sent Divines that would be active in their condemnation.

Finally, you tell us *that this point of Universal Redemption, was together with the rest condemned in the Synod of* Dort.

Now nothing was in that Synod condemned, but what our Divines consented to, they have subscribed to all the determinations of the Synod, relating to the death of Christ therefore either the Synod did not condemn universal redemption, or our Divines did not according to their Orders.

The Reader, by this time sees what terrible executions the Doctor hath done on himself, and more need not be said about the Synod of *Dort*, as it relateth to our *English* affaires.

Some things done in *England*, and misrelated by the Doctor, must be rectified, *Pag.* 105. He essayes to make a Salve for the Recantation imposed on Mr. *Sympson*, for some passages in a Sermon before the King, at *Royston*, 1616. and he would fain have us think that the *King took no offence at his saying, that the committing any great Sin did for the present extinguish grace, and Gods Spirit, for in that he went no further then* Overal *had done.*

This is very untrue, for *Overal* never said so, nor could say so, according to his principles, but what then did the King take exception at? *at nothing but the Preachers expounding the seventh to the* Romanes *as Arminius had done*, or rather his, *Fathering the exposition on Arminius.*

But either the Preacher did bring this exposition of Arminius to credit an Arminian notion, or he did not, if he did then it was the Arminianisme of the exposition that gave distast, if not, would it not sound like tyranny in the King, to injoyne a Learned man a Recantation, meerly because he used such an exposition of a place of Scripture, as Arminius had used.

Take the place of a Regenerate man, Arminius his Doctrine cannot stand, as the wise King well saw, and therefore he sent to the two Professors of Cambridge to have their judgment in the case, who sent their judgment in favour of St. *Austins* exposition.

Further the Doctor observes, that *the Professors did not do this of their own Authority, but as set on by the King*, *Pag.* 106.

I wonder how they could give their judgments to the King at *Royston*, of a Sermon Preached before him until they were by his Majesty required so to do.

Ai, *But the Professors were not so forward as to move in it of themselves, as may appeare by their not answering of* Tompsons *Booke*, de intercisione gratiæ & justificationis, *though the Author of it were a member of that*

that University, but leaving it to be confuted by Dr. Abbot, *their Brother in the Chair at* Oxford, *so great an alteration had been made in* Cambridge, *since the first striking up of their heat against* Baro, *and* Barret.

O what a superfœtations of Doctrines are here upon nothing, or what is less then nothing.

First, Dr. *Abbot*, when he confuted *Tompson*, was not Doctor of the Chair, but Bishop of *Salisbury*, and so no Brother to the Professors at Cambridge, 1616.

Second, The professors at Cambridge then were Dr. *Richardson*, originally of Emanuel, a Colledge that in those dayes offorded few Arminians, and Dr. *John Davenant*, a very able and zealous opposer of Arminianism, as all know.

Third, The Cambridge professors might not count themselves concerned to confute *Tompson*, because his Book was not Printed in their University, nor indeed in *England*, and because *Tompsons* life had confuted his Book at Cambridge.

He was a man of a most debauched conversation, and confirmed himself in his debauchedness, by his Arminianism; for when men reproved him for his prophaness, he would say my will is free, I am a Child of the Devil to day, to morrow I will make my self a Child of God, this more then any answer to the Book would confirme the Cantabrigians, that he was not an enemy to perseverance as a Doctrine leading to impiety.

Well, but did not King *James*, by his directions to the University, *Jan.* 18, 1619. "Direct that young students "in Divinity be appointed to study such Books, as be "most agreeable in Doctrine and discipline to the Church "of *England*, and excited to bestow their time in the "Fathers, and Councells, Schoole-men, Histories, and "Controversies, and not to insist too long upon Com-"pendiums, and Abbreviations, making them the ground "of their study in Divinity?

Really he did so, and I heartily wish the direction had been observed, for then had Arminianism been crushed in the shell; I think next to the study of the Holy Scrip-

tures, the reading of the Fathers is the best preservative against Arminianism, which came into the low Countrys with the contempt of the Fathers; as for Calvinisme it cannot be condemned, if sentence be passed upon it out of the Fathers, those I mean, who professed to set themselves to handle the Controversies concerning grace and predestination.

Sure I am the Royal directions notwithstanding, the University continued as highly or more highly Calvinistical then ever, a manifest argument that the University looked upon the Kings directions, as no way tending to root out Calvinistical Doctrine, but rather as a meanes to confirm it, and so indeed they were.

The Doctor will not yet give over, but, *Page* 108. Tells us of certain Orders sent out, *Anno* 1622. *Aug.* 4th. designed to put a bridle into the Calvinists mouths.

These Orders it is notoriously known were put out at such a time when the Spanish match was driving on, and common people began to have thoughts of heart whither the releasing of Recusants, and the Articles of Marriage might tend; in those Orders care was taken among other things, that no undecent expressions should be used against Puritanes, but it was also provided "that no Preacher of "what title so ever under the degree of a Bishop or Dean "at least, should thenceforth presume to teach in any "popular auditory, the deep points of predestination, &c. "but rather leave these points to be handled by learned "men, and that modestly and moderately by use and "application, rather then by positive Doctrine.

And this was a right good Order for Calvinists, who never suffer so much from any thing, as the declamatory attempts of men in popular Sermons; in the Schooles where Syllogismes must be used, their Doctrine is not in much danger, because he who disputes must keep himself close to the State of the Question, through not representing of which, Arminians get all their Advantage.

Mr. *Ford*, did make choice of that piece of Calvinism which is most liable to exception, the absolute decree of

of reprobation, and I confess, when I was a young proud graduate, I had read his Book, and did think it perfectly unanswerable, but when I had the good hap to meet with Bishop *Davenants* answer to it, I was marvelously altered in my opinion, and estemation concerning the strength of the Book (keeping still an high opinion of the Author of it,) for I found that the absolute decree of reprobation was quite another thing, then it was Represented.

There was in *Oxford*, after the coming out of the aforesaid Orders of the King, a Sermon Preached in the University Church, by Mr. *Gabriel Bridges*, against the absolute decree, this saith the Doctor was a *violating of the Kings Order*, (you must pity him, he had nothing else to say,) *and this laid him open to the persecution of Dr.* Prideaux, *and to the censure of the Vice-chancelor.*

But all who have searched the Register, do know that violation of the Kings Order was never so much as once laid to Mr. *Bridges* his charge, he was accused for Preaching contrary to truth, and contrary to the Articles of Religion established among us, and was Ordred to maintaine in the Schooles, the Contrary to what he had Preached in the Pulpit and he did so, and never altered his mind afterwards.

Indeed it had been most ridiculous, once to imagine that a Sermon Preached, in the University Church could violate the Kings Order manifestly restrained to popular Auditories, in which number the University Auditories were never placed.

The Doctor hath one Card more left to play, which if it hit not, he will have a perfect Slam, what is that? it is his dear friend Mr. *Mountague*, whom he imagineth in his *Gagger* to have disclaimed all the Calvinian tenets, and to have asserted the Church to her primitive and genuine Doctrines.

(Creditis? an qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt.)

Well, what of this *Gagger*? why, information was prepared against it by two worthy men, Mr. *Yates*, and

and Mr. *Ward*, a signe it was looked on as tending to innovation.

What doth Mr. *Montague*, after he had got a copy of this information, he flees for shelter to King *James* (poor man did he flee for shelter, against the information of two Lecturers) what shelter did he there find? why, King *James*, (having now acted a Part at the Synod of *Dort*, condemned the Arminians, that he might save the Prince of *Orange*, and Arch-Bishop *Abbot*, coming not at him, and Dr. *James Mountague* being dead,) *was Master of himself*, (it seemes before he had been a servant to others,) *and Governed by the Light of his own most cleare and excellent judgment, took both* Mountague *and his Doctrines into his Protection and gave him*, a quietus est, *from all those Calumnies of* Popery, *and Arminianism that were by the informers laid on him, commanded* Dr. Francis White, *to see his Appeale he was in hand with, Licenced for the Press, and finally gave Order to* Mountague, *to dedicate the Book when Licenced to his Royal self.*

These things are very unlikely, that a King should give command to have a Book Licenced before he had seen it, or knew what would be in it, and that he should give Order to have it Dedicated to himself, and because they are unlikely I could be glad to see them confirmed, by some irrefragable Authority, but find no Authority alledged, wherefore I am a very unbeliever in all these matters, so are most I meet with. But these things I am certaine of.

First, That in Mr. *Mountagues* Appeale there be downright untruths in matter of fact, in which I do not find the Doctor going about to Justifie, or excuse him.

Secondly, That never Book gave more discontent, for it was answered by no fewer then five or six all considerable in the Nation, all agreeing that he had departed from the Doctrine of the Church, the Book was also censured in Parliament, as contrary to our Articles; Arch-Bishop *Abbot*, indeavoured the stopping of it before it came to light, Dr. *White* who had approved it did publickly

publickly complaine what a trick the Bishops had served him, promising to joyne with him in the approbation of the Book, but yet cowardly slipping their necks out of the Collar, and leaving him to beare the whole envy of the Midwifery of so distastful a Book.

Finally, King *Charles* himself, was feigne both to pardon *Mountague* for all this Writings, and at last to call in his Book, as the great occasion of many unnecessary troubles.

So I let pass Mr. *Mountague*, of whom Dr. *Prideaux* publickly said, *that he was more a Grammarian then a Divine.*

As for King *James*, we are sure, (from the Pen of Dr. *Featly*, never used to wrong his Sovereign,) that, not many weeks before his death, he called the Arminians Hereticks, and so we conclude *that for all his, and Queen* Elizabeths *dayes they were accounted Hereticks, and their Doctrine Heresy*, and seeing they were then so accounted, why now the broachers of that Doctrine, should be accounted the most obedient Sons of the Church, is a question in which I would most gladly be satisfied, untill such satisfaction be gained, it will be at least a pardonable error to suppose that, that is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, which for above threescore Yeares after her first establishment, was not averred in any one Licenced Book, but confuted in many.

FINIS.